



Wellesley College
Library



This book-plate was designed in 1909
by Edith Butler Pool
(Class of 1896) for her library.

It seems appropriate
that it should be used to mark the books
purchased for the
Department of English Literature
through her memorial bequest





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2010 with funding from
Boston Library Consortium Member Libraries



EDWARD BOUVERIE PUSEY

Oxford

HORACE HART, PRINTER TO THE UNIVERSITY





*The Rev. Edward Bouverie Pusey, D.D.
from a Portrait by Miss Rosa Vender.*

Life of
Edward Bouverie Pusey

DOCTOR OF DIVINITY
CANON OF CHRIST CHURCH; REGIUS PROFESSOR OF
HEBREW IN THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

BY

HENRY PARRY LIDDON, D.D.

D.C.L.; LL.D.; LATE CANON AND CHANCELLOR OF ST. PAUL'S

EDITED AND PREPARED FOR PUBLICATION BY THE

REV. J. O. JOHNSTON, M.A.

VICAR OF ALL SAINTS, OXFORD; AND THE

REV. ROBERT J. WILSON, M.A.

WARDEN OF KEBLE COLLEGE

HON. FELLOW AND FORMERLY TUTOR OF MERTON COLLEGE

IN FOUR VOLUMES: VOL. I (1800—1836)

With Portraits and Illustrations

Fourth Edition

LONDON

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.

AND NEW YORK: 15 EAST 16TH STREET

1894

All rights reserved

12/25/95
P. C. H.

239953

BX

5199

P925

1894

1

PREFACE



DR. PUSEY died September 16, 1882. At the large gathering that met at Oxford on the occasion of his funeral five days later, it was generally felt, that the one man who was fitted to undertake his Biography, was Dr. Liddon. In the afternoon of that day, the matter was mentioned to him at a smaller meeting of intimate friends; and a few days later he accepted the responsibility.

From the moment that he undertook the duty, he felt the heavy burden that lay upon him. His private diary from that time gives constant, and at first even daily, expression to this feeling. To him it was no mere literary undertaking; it was a task in which his deepest affections and interests were concerned. It was the setting forth the life-work and delineating the character of one who was to him—with all his intense and devoted affection—his ‘*dilectissimus amicus*,’ to use the words of his diary, ‘the most dear and revered of friends, of whose friendship I have all along been so utterly unworthy.’ But, besides this, Dr. Pusey was also, in Dr. Liddon’s eyes, one of the prime leaders and, as time went on,

the main support of that great Church movement, which, in his opinion, re-invigorated and even revived the religion of England.

Adequately to discharge the task he had undertaken, Dr. Liddon put aside as far as possible all other literary labours; and his sense of the responsibility thus resting on him was amongst the causes that determined him at once to resign, to the great regret of many, his Professorship of Exegesis in the University.

The duties connected with the Canonry of St. Paul's still remained. That position—to the various demands of which he was keenly sensitive, and around which he was ever accumulating fresh obligations—left him very little unbroken leisure: all of it, however, he ungrudgingly devoted to preparing and writing this Biography. Indeed, as conceived on the plan he had sketched out for himself, his new task constantly deprived him of the holidays he required, and even made him deny himself the relaxation and rest which his physicians frequently enjoined, and which his health imperatively demanded.

How elaborate the plan of the 'Life' as projected by Dr. Liddon was, those only can realize who were intimate with his methods of work, and with his conception of what was due to all that was said, written, and done by him whom, after Cardinal Newman's example, he used affectionately to call '*ὁ μέγας*.' To him at the outset, any letter whatever of Dr. Pusey's or Mr. Keble's was a precious treasure, which he hardly ventured to curtail, much

less to omit; and it was his nature to be dissatisfied with any account of an event which failed to trace both causes and consequences. Hence the work grew to great dimensions under his hand.

Yet that Dr. Liddon fully appreciated the difficulty of his task is shown by the following fragment found among his papers, and probably intended to be embodied in his own Preface.

‘There are much fewer materials for a Life of Dr. Pusey than might be anticipated. He kept no diary. He destroyed the greater part of the letters which he received from even distinguished correspondents. His own letters were generally undated, and although they have been preserved in great numbers, it is often very difficult to discover the special subject to which a given letter refers. His indifference to literary form is in nothing more apparent than in his correspondence; he answers a correspondent without preface, just as he might have replied to a question put to him in a room.

‘On the other hand his life, although profoundly influential, was singularly uneventful. It was a continuous stream of lectures, sermons, letters, interviews. It presents few striking incidents like that of Bishop Selwyn, few points of contact with the world at large or with distinguished men like that of Bishop Wilberforce. Its interest lies in itself:—and the means for studying what it was are much more meagre than might have been expected.

‘A hundred years hence many materials will be

available for a Life of Dr. Pusey which are not now.'

It was the pleasure and great privilege of one of the present editors to work at Dr. Liddon's side from the commencement of the task, and thus to follow and understand what he meant the Biography to be, as well as to witness almost daily his method of working.

As time went on, as health was failing, and as the prospect of completing the 'Life' became more remote, Dr. Liddon put into writing some instructions for the guidance of those to whom he intended to entrust the task in the event of his own death. When, after repeated warnings, his health finally broke down in June, 1890, and, to the profound grief of his friends, and loss of the Church at large, his death followed very rapidly, he left behind him carefully arranged materials for the whole of the 'Life,' and an elaborate first draft of the work up to 1856.

His literary executors, as appointed in his Will, were Dr. Francis Paget, now the Very Rev. the Dean of Christ Church; the Rev. Charles Gore, Principal of the Pusey House; and the Rev. J. O. Johnston, Vicar of All Saints, Oxford. Of these, Mr. Gore at once undertook the editing of some of Dr. Liddon's unpublished works, in particular the *Passiontide Sermons* and the 'Analytical Exposition of the Epistle to the Romans.' Dr. Paget and Mr. Johnston set to work to complete the 'Life of Dr. Pusey.'

When Dr. Paget was appointed to the Deanery of Christ Church, he soon found it impossible to

continue to take an active part in this work. Consequently in July, 1892, the literary executors requested the Rev. Robert J. Wilson, Warden of Keble College, to take his place.

With such expedition as has been possible amid the pressure of their ordinary duties, the present editors have done their best to carry out what they knew of Dr. Liddon's intentions. Dr. Liddon had expressly stated that what he had written was not in his judgment at all in a state for publication; at the same time it of course indicated the scale on which he intended the 'Life' to be published.

The editors therefore, though compelled carefully to examine and revise the whole of the manuscript, did not feel themselves in any way at liberty materially to alter the character, the scale, or the plan of the work. This would have involved writing a new Life of Dr. Pusey, instead of editing Dr. Liddon's projected work, and would have entailed, as they think, a grave loss to all readers.

If any justification be needed for the magnitude of the Biography as now projected, it must be found in this—that it is the record of the long life and of the varied relations of one who, up to the day of his death, continuously played, as Dr. Liddon says, a 'profoundly influential' part in the great religious awakening of this century. The two present volumes bring down the history of the Oxford Movement past the great crisis of 1845, and will enable the reader to see Dr. Pusey with indomitable hopefulness, in spite of the grave perplexities and embarrass-

ments caused by Newman's secession, patiently continuing his labours in the Revival of the Church of England.

The editors hope, if life and health continue, to complete, at a comparatively early date, the two remaining volumes.

One or two observations are necessary as explanatory of certain obvious and seemingly avoidable defects. Dr. Pusey persistently refused to sit for his portrait. He was the subject of a few hasty and surreptitious sketches, one or two of which are thought sufficiently interesting to be placed in his Biography. But his friends endeavoured nevertheless to obtain a more worthy likeness of the Doctor ; and from such materials as were available, at least two portraits were painted. One is in the Hall of Christ Church : another is at the Pusey House. The editors think that this last, by Miss Rosa Corder, is the best likeness, and they have obtained permission to engrave it for a Frontispiece. They have ventured to insert at the beginning of the second volume the rough sketch made by the late Mr. Edward Kilvert, because it met with the approval of some of Dr. Pusey's oldest friends. In the later volumes one or more of the sketches above mentioned will appear, and also an engraving from a drawing, which was taken immediately after Dr. Pusey's death by Mr. Alexander Macdonald, of Oxford.

Dr. Liddon had intended to head every chapter with an appropriate motto ; but he had selected them only in a very few instances. The editors have not

endeavoured to make the chapters uniform in this respect, as they felt that, if the mottoes were not the choice of Dr. Liddon himself, their charm would be lost.

It is of course impossible to express with that inimitable grace which Dr. Liddon would have employed the deep sense of obligation due to those who put letters, papers, &c. at his disposal. Yet it may be said that the kindness and confidence he received in this regard was very great, and that he always expressed his deep appreciation of it. In particular he was indebted to Dr. Pusey's only surviving daughter, Mrs. Brine; to the family of Mr. Keble; and to Cardinal Newman, for the use of invaluable papers of all sorts. But indeed many friends have both before and since Dr. Liddon's death given assistance of this kind. To all these sincerest thanks are due.

They, and indeed all who are interested in Dr. Pusey's character and work, must feel the irreparable loss the Biography sustained by Dr. Liddon's death. The longer the editors have worked, the more keenly have they felt that nothing but their duty to a revered friend, who had devoted so much of his time and abilities to preparing this book, can justify their boldness in attempting to complete his unfinished task.

J. O. J.
R. J. W.

CONTENTS OF VOL. I



CHAPTER I. 1800-1822.

	PAGE
PARENTAGE—EARLY LIFE AT HOME—SCHOOL DAYS AT MITCHAM—ETON—CHRIST CHURCH	I

CHAPTER II. 1822.

SWISS TOUR—BYRONISM—FIRST CONTACT WITH UNBELIEF—MARRIAGE OF PHILIP PUSEY	33
--	----

CHAPTER III. 1823-1824.

ORIEL COLLEGE—FIRST INTRODUCTION TO NEWMAN—ELECTION TO FELLOWSHIP—EARLY ESTIMATE OF PUSEY—DR. LLOYD'S LECTURES—LATIN ESSAY PRIZE—APPENDIX: LETTER FROM THE LATE DR. CHURCH, DEAN OF ST. PAUL'S	54
--	----

CHAPTER IV. 1825-1826.

FIRST VISIT TO GERMANY—EICHHORN—THOLUCK—SCHLEIERMACHER—NEANDER—OTHER PROFESSORS—LITERARY PLANS	70
--	----

CHAPTER V. 1826-1827.

SECOND VISIT TO GERMANY—LECTURES AT BERLIN—ARABIC STUDIES—KOSGARTEN—LIFE AT BONN—FREYTAG—LÜCKE—SACK—PUSEY'S RELIGIOUS INFLUENCE—DEATH OF YOUNGEST BROTHER—OVERWORK—DR. LLOYD, BISHOP OF OXFORD	94
--	----

CHAPTER VI. 1827-1828.

	PAGE
ENGAGEMENT TO MISS BARKER—REVISION OF THE AUTHORIZED VERSION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT—ILLNESS—CORRESPONDENCE WITH MISS BARKER . . .	115

CHAPTER VII. 1828.

THE PROVOSTSHIP OF ORIEL—DEATH OF MR. PUSEY—ORDINATION—MARRIAGE—FIRST SERMON . . .	135
--	-----

CHAPTER VIII. 1828-1830.

CONTROVERSY WITH REV. H. J. ROSE ON THE THEOLOGY OF GERMANY	146
---	-----

CHAPTER IX. 1828.

RETURN TO OXFORD—DEATH OF HEBREW PROFESSOR—APPOINTMENT TO PROFESSORSHIP—ORDINATION TO THE PRIESTHOOD—INSTALLATION AS CANON . . .	178
--	-----

CHAPTER X. 1829-1832.

IN RESIDENCE AT CHRIST CHURCH—COMMENCEMENT OF HEBREW LECTURES—ELECTION OF 1829—DEATH OF BISHOP LLOYD—ARABIC CATALOGUE—OXFORD SOCIETY IN 1830—SEVERE ILLNESS—SANSKRIT PROFESSORSHIP—PUSEY AND ELLERTON SCHOLARSHIPS—INFIDEL LECTURES—BRITISH ASSOCIATION—FIRST UNIVERSITY SERMON—DEATH OF YOUNGEST CHILD—‘REMARKS ON CATHEDRAL INSTITUTIONS’—APPENDIX: THE REV. E. B. PUSEY TO DR. THOLUCK; THE REV. J. H. NEWMAN TO REV. E. B. PUSEY . . .	193
--	-----

CHAPTER XI. 1833.

RISE OF THE OXFORD MOVEMENT—REACTION FROM EIGHTEENTHCENTURY THOUGHT—WALTER SCOTT—COLERIDGE—THE EVANGELICAL MOVEMENT—DR. SIKES—JOSHUA WATSON—ALEXANDER KNOX—HUGH JAMES ROSE—REVOLUTIONARY ECCLESIASTICAL PROPOSALS—THE HADLEIGH CONFERENCE—THE ‘FRIENDS OF THE CHURCH’—THE TRACTS—KEBLE—NEWMAN—PUSEY	253
---	-----

CHAPTER XII. 1833-1834.

	PAGE
THE EARLY TRACTS—PUSEY'S FIRST TRACT, ON FASTING —ARNOLD'S CRITICISMS—ILLNESS—CONTROVERSY ABOUT SUBSCRIPTION—THE DUKE OF WELLINGTON CHANCELLOR—PROPOSED HEBREW NEW TESTAMENT.	275

CHAPTER XIII. 1834-1835.

DR. HAMPDEN ON SUBSCRIPTION—THE DOGMATIC PRIN- CIPLE—PUSEY'S DEFENCE OF SUBSCRIPTION—A DE- CLARATION PROPOSED—MR. GLADSTONE'S VIEWS— THE PROVOST OF ORIEL'S PAMPHLET—PUSEY'S REPLY —BLANCO WHITE, A SOCINIAN—CORRESPONDENCE —APPENDIX: REV. E. B. PUSEY TO PHILIP PUSEY, ESQ., M.P.	298
---	-----

CHAPTER XIV. 1835-1836.

THOLUCK'S VISIT TO OXFORD—STUDIES ON THE SACRA- MENTS—CHRIST CHURCH BUSINESS—CHURCHES IN EAST LONDON—THE THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY—ASSIST- ANCE TO GRADUATE STUDENTS OF THEOLOGY— APPENDIX: THE THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY.	321
--	-----

CHAPTER XV. 1835.

THE TRACT ON BAPTISM—CONTINUANCE AND EDITORSHIP OF THE 'TRACTS FOR THE TIMES' IN DOUBT	343
---	-----

CHAPTER XVI. 1836.

THE HAMPDEN CONTROVERSY—BLANCO WHITE'S IN- FLUENCE—HAMPDEN, BAMPTON LECTURER—MORAL PHILOSOPHY PROFESSOR—APPOINTED REGIUS PRO- FESSOR OF DIVINITY—OPPOSITION—DR. ARNOLD'S VIOLENT ATTACK ON THE TRACTARIANS—HAMPDEN DISQUALIFIED—DEAN CHURCH'S JUDGMENT ON THE CONTROVERSY.	359
--	-----

CHAPTER XVII. 1836.

ON SACRILEGE—ON PRAYER—ON CATHEDRAL REFORM —OLD TESTAMENT STUDIES—THE MINISTRY OF THE PRIESTHOOD—CATHOLIC PRINCIPLES—CAMBRIDGE VISITORS—IMPRESSIONS OF OXFORD	391
--	-----

CHAPTER XVIII. 1836.

	PAGE
THE LIBRARY OF THE FATHERS	409

APPENDIX A.

HISTORY OF THE PUSEY AND BOUVERIE FAMILIES . . .	449
--	-----

 LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

PORTRAIT OF DR. PUSEY, FROM A PAINTING BY MISS ROSA CORDER	<i>Frontispiece</i>
PUSEY HOUSE, BERKS	8
ALL SAINTS CHURCH, PUSEY	191
DR. PUSEY'S LODGINGS IN CHRIST CHURCH—	
FROM TOM QUADRANGLE	193
FROM THE SOUTH-WEST	209
FRONTISPIECE TO THE LIBRARY OF THE FATHERS . . .	444

THE LIFE

OF

EDWARD BOUVERIE PUSEY

CHAPTER I.

PARENTAGE — EARLY LIFE AT HOME — SCHOOL DAYS
AT MITCHAM — ETON — CHRIST CHURCH.

1800-1822.

‘In every phenomenon the Beginning remains always the most notable moment.’—CARLYLE, *Sartor Resartus*, bk. ii. c. i.

EDWARD BOUVERIE PUSEY was born at Pusey House, in Berkshire, on Friday, the 22nd of August, 1800.

His father was the Honourable Philip Bouverie, the youngest son of Jacob, first Viscount Folkestone; the name of Bouverie having been exchanged by him for that of Pusey of Pusey, as a condition of succession to the Pusey estate¹.

His mother was Lady Lucy Sherard, daughter of Robert, fourth Earl of Harborough, and widow of Sir Thomas Cave, Baronet.

Edward was the second son of his parents, born just two years after their marriage. Their eldest son, Philip, was a little more than a year his senior². The two elder

¹ A full account of the Pusey and Bouverie families will be found in the Appendix at the end of this volume.

² The children of the Hon. Philip Pusey were—Philip: b. June 25, 1799; d. July 9, 1855. Edward Bouverie: b. Aug. 22, 1800; d. Sept. 16, 1882. Lucy Bouverie: b. April 21, 1802; d. April 25, 1802. Elizabeth Bouverie (Mrs. Luxmoore): b. April

25, 1803; d. March 23, 1883 (Good Friday). Harriet Bouverie: b. May 16, 1804; d. June 17, 1804. Eleanor Bouverie: b. May 16, 1805; d. May 21, 1806. Charlotte Bouverie (Mrs. Cotton): b. May 15, 1807; d. July 2, 1883. William Bouverie: b. May 14, 1810; d. April 19, 1888. Henry Bouverie: b. June 4, 1814; d. Feb. 17, 1827.

brothers were divided by an interval of ten years from the two younger: they thus formed a natural pair, both at home and at school, and were regarded by their parents and by the younger children as a sort of duumvirate, occupying a distinct rank in the family.

Three weeks after his birth Edward Pusey was christened in the Parish Church¹ of All Saints, at Pusey, on Sunday, September 14th, 1800. The circumstance that this day is Holy Cross Day in the calendar of the Prayer-book was not without its influence on Pusey's life. He always observed the anniversary not only as an act of thanksgiving to God for making him in baptism a member of Christ, but also as a token that his life was thus providentially marked out for consecration to the mystery of Redeeming Love.

Pusey's father was fifty-two years old at the date of his marriage—twenty-four years older than his wife. This relative seniority, and the bachelor habits which were too fixed to be entirely surrendered, imparted a certain formal stiffness,—perhaps even an austerity,—to the home-life at Pusey. An almost military exactness was insisted on in all the domestic arrangements. His politics were those of an inflexible Tory: he had an equal horror of 'Whigs and atheists,' and when speaking of them together would use *and* rather than *or*. Portraits of Pitt and other Tory statesmen adorned the walls of his study; and his intercourse with society, especially in London, was largely controlled by political feeling. When his eldest son desired to marry Lady Emily Herbert, Mr. Pusey opposed the match on the ground that her father Lord Carnarvon was 'a Whig who made speeches on behalf of Queen Caroline.' When the engagement had lasted for four years Mr. Pusey consented to waive his political objections: he lived to regret that he had ever entertained them.

He was a well-informed as well as an able man; but the library, both at Pusey and at 35 Grosvenor Square, was

¹ The font which was used on this occasion is now in the church of Grove, near Wantage.

not so well stocked as might have been anticipated. His reading lay among a certain class of political treatises, books of travel, and the sermons of Barrow and Tillotson. But during the holidays Mr. Pusey took a great deal of trouble to foster literary tastes in his two elder boys; and with this view gradually collected an extensive and varied family library.

The ruling feature of Mr. Pusey's character was his eager benevolence: to no occupation did he address himself more seriously than to the relief of poverty and suffering. His charities were studiously unostentatious, and, when his income is considered, profuse¹. His poor neighbours and dependents had, as he always considered, a first claim on him²: but he was a regular subscriber to nearly all the great London charities; while poor clergymen, embarrassed tradesmen, distressed families, cottagers and labourers in all directions were constantly appealing to him, and they rarely appealed in vain. As long before his death his name was famous for lavish generosity, he did not always escape the wiles of impostors; and although he had a large share of common sense, his own simple integrity of character made it difficult for him to suspect others of deception. When, at his death, his elder sons wished to describe their father's character, they called him 'pious and bounteous³.'

The former epithet was not less deserved than the latter, though in the somewhat restricted and artificial sense which it has sometimes borne it would have been out of place. Mr. Pusey used to tell his sons that when he and his half-brothers went in the morning to their father Lord Folkestone's room, they always knelt down to receive his blessing before wishing him good-day. Even before his marriage

¹ Mr. Pusey kept his accounts with great accuracy. His private account-books, intended only for his own eye, remain to show how large a portion of his income was devoted to charitable objects.

² Mr. and Lady Lucy Pusey always began their charities with a gift of £100 in winter clothes to the poor of the small hamlet of Pusey. So

regular was the gift that, after some years, the villagers came to think that the gift was of legal obligation, due to the tenantry as a condition of holding the estate.

³ The inscription on the window to his memory in the south transept of Pusey parish church runs thus: 'To the memory of Philip Pusey, Pious and Bounteous, A. D. 1828.'

his life was assuming more and more the character of a quiet protest against the carelessness and irreligion of the age. If anything was said in his presence against morality or religion, he left the room, no matter who might be in the company. He was a man of quick feelings and temper; and he may have distrusted his own power of self-command while yet he was anxious to express moral disapproval. It might have been anticipated that he would sympathize with the so-called Evangelical movement, which, whatever its deficiencies as an exponent of the Christian Revelation, was in those days a protest on behalf of religious earnestness in an age of careless indifference. But he suspected it, not altogether without reason, of a disposition to think more highly of emotion than of conscience; and to an eminently practical character this suspicion was decisive. Mr. Pusey was still living when his son Edward explained his attitude towards 'Evangelicalism' to a correspondent who was to a certain extent under its influence.

'My father,' he wrote in 1827, 'from hearing and seeing the abuses of preaching faith (as it has been often preached) *without* works, connects no other idea with the "being justified by faith only" than by faith *exclusive* of works—not only as not entitling us to salvation, but as being in no way necessary to it. . . . From his dwelling rather on the holiness of God, than on the imperfection and weakness of man, the *agenda* have, in the *statement* at least of his system, assumed a predominance.'

For the rest, Mr. Pusey was a man of strong will, who liked to have his own way, which was, in the main, a very good way. He was formed to be a domestic autocrat. In early life he had ruled his mother, Lady Folkestone. In later life he ruled his wife, and, while they were young, his children. As his boys grew up to manhood, it was inevitable that clever lads, with strong characters, would quietly assert a measure of independence which curtailed the frontiers of their father's domestic empire. But they always regarded him with affection, and still more with reverence, although his age and the habits of that generation interposed between them and himself a distance and constraint which would now be considered excessive.

When they were young his reserved habits made the boisterous society of children unwelcome to him; and they had taken their own line when they were old enough to be his companions.

Thus it happened that the real training of his two eldest sons was left by Mr. Pusey to their mother, who, to do her justice, was far from unwilling to undertake the responsibility. Lady Lucy Pusey, in the later years of her life, was sometimes referred to as a typical lady of the days of Fox and Pitt. She was tall, slim, with long hands and tapering fingers,—a feature in which all her children, and not least her second son, resembled her. She commonly wore a watered-silk dress, very plain, with large lace collars and ruffles. With a sweet but piercing expression in her blue eyes, there was still a touch of severity in her bearing: she rarely or never would lean back in her chair, and she used to say that to stoop was the mark of a degenerate age. When in 1857, at the age of eighty-five, her health was failing, she never allowed herself to lie down or rest on a couch of any kind during the day. In the last year or two of her life she reluctantly consented to be taken in a sedan chair to South Audley Street Chapel, which she attended.

Lady Lucy gave people the impression of being a very practical and unsentimental person. There was occasionally in her manner that touch of bluntness which so often veils an affectionateness or a sensitive refinement that shrinks from exposure. Although perhaps not a clever woman, she had a fund of love in her nature which enabled her to see further, and to do more with her life, than is often given to mere cleverness. She was a devoted wife, consulting her husband's prejudices, at whatever inconvenience to herself; she shared to the full his benevolent instincts; she reinforced, or more probably she adopted, his precise and methodical ways, and heartily carried out all his wishes. Her time was laid out by rule: a certain portion was always given to reading the Bible; and another portion to some book of established literary

merit,—generally an historical author. She would read this book with a watch at her side; and as soon as the self-prescribed time for such reading had elapsed, she eagerly turned to the more congenial task of needlework for charitable purposes. On Sundays, the time before, between, and after the Church services, was regularly spent in taking short walks, or in reading sermons.

The secret of Lady Lucy's influence with her children, and especially with her second son, lay in her character. Pusey used to dwell with enthusiasm on his mother's charity, self-forgetfulness, and conscientiousness. She took a great deal of pains to screen her good deeds from publicity. Thus instead of allowing her name to appear among the subscribers to a hospital, she would, year by year, slip her £10 note into the box for donations. After her husband's death she made her home in Grosvenor Square 'a family hotel,' as she called it: and, to the end of her life, she would insist upon giving up her own room, and sleeping in a small passage-room, to provide accommodation for others. Although she had much natural dignity of bearing, she heartily believed herself to be inferior to every one about her; there were no limits to her unaffected self-depreciation and modesty. Yet she was capable of great decision at the call of duty; her quiet courage and determination always enabled her to do what was distasteful, if it had to be done.

Although a woman of strong affections, she was ever able to control herself, in times of anxiety or sorrow, for the sake of those about her: and she never allowed the indulgence of feeling, however keen, to dispense her from the obligations of the moment. She attached great importance to the rule that actions should always be in advance of professions; and when she expressed herself warmly, it was thought remarkable. 'My mother's expressions of joy,' writes Pusey, 'are conveyed more in actions than in words. She always writes and says much less than she feels.'

Pusey consistently attributed the greatest blessings which he had received from Almighty God to his mother's influence.

Perhaps in later life he may, to a certain extent, and unconsciously, have idealized it; but no one could know Lady Lucy Pusey and not be sure that her son was right in the main. Her life was a conspicuous example of love, disciplined by a sense of duty. Her tender love for himself used to remind him of St. Augustine's words about St. Monica: 'Non satis eloquor quid erga me habebat animi.'

When he had not yet learnt the Church Catechism, he used to sit on a footstool at his mother's knee, while his elder brother, Philip, stood and answered questions. One day his mother told him that the time had now come for him to learn the Catechism too. He said, 'I know it.' His mother asked him how he had come to know it. 'By hearing Philip say it to you,' was the reply. The boys used to say all their lessons to Lady Lucy before breakfast. When either of them was out of temper, she would put the lessons off until after breakfast, saying, 'You are not fit to say your lesson now: you will do better by and bye.' The staple of her instructions was religion: and especially our Lord's words and acts and the Church Catechism. 'All that I know about religious truth,' Dr. Pusey would say, 'I learnt, at least in principle, from my dear mother.' 'But then,' he would add, 'behind my mother, though of course I did not know it at the time, was the Catholic Church.' Commenting in 1879 on some statements which had been made in America respecting his religious history, Dr. Pusey wrote to a friend:—

'I was educated in the teaching of the Prayer-book. . . . The doctrine of the Real Presence I learnt from my mother's explanation of the Catechism, which she had learned to understand from older clergy.'

Edward Pusey was a pale, thin, little child, with light flaxen hair, a somewhat high forehead, and light blue eyes. His mother used to say that no child could be more obedient or industrious: she used to speak of him as her 'angelic' son, a phrase which in a person of her reserved and prosaic temper was by no means a flower of rhetoric. His daily playmates were his elder brother Philip and his sister Elizabeth, who was three years younger, and who

admired, and, so far as she could, emulated the proceedings of her brothers, as younger sisters do. She had a special love for her brother Edward, who, in those early years, 'did whatever she bid him.' As the boys grew older, they made friends with the keeper Warman, who taught them to shoot, and with the groom, who taught them to ride. In both pursuits, the younger brother soon excelled the



PUSEY HOUSE, BERKS.

future squire. 'Master Edward is a better shot,' the keeper used to say, 'than young Mr. Pusey: he do take more pains about it.' Long before he went up to Oxford Edward Pusey was well known as a very good rider across country.

There was not much society at Pusey; Mr. Pusey's reserved habits combined with his strong political feelings to limit it; but he and his wife entertained their relations and more intimate neighbours¹. Of this limited society,

¹ Among the more intimate and constant visitors were the Bouveries of de la Pré Abbey, Lord Radnor, members of the Reeve family, and Lady Pepys, the widow of Sir Lucas Pepys, the Court physician. Of neighbours who were

constantly at the house were Sir Robert Throckmorton, of Buckland; and later, Archdeacon and Lady Catharine Berens, of Shrivenham; and the Rev. E. and Lady Frances Bouverie, of Coleshill Rectory.

however, the children naturally saw little in their early years: they made their first acquaintance with the world when they went to school.

In 1807, when Edward Pusey was seven years old, the two brothers were sent to a school, of which the Rev. Richard Roberts was master, at Mitcham in Surrey. It was a school preparatory for Eton, and had a great reputation. Mr. Roberts was a scholar himself, and of a race of scholars¹; and the list of his pupils who afterwards figured in public life is sufficiently distinguished². On going to Mitcham Edward Pusey was at once placed at the head of his class.

Mr. Roberts was a schoolmaster of the old race, and as such believed more in the efficacy of corporal punishment than of moral influences³. To drop a penknife was a serious offence; and Edward Pusey was once flogged for cutting a pencil at both ends. But the one crime which was never pardoned was a false quantity. Mr. Roberts was himself very accurate, and he 'knew how boys could be taught accuracy, if they could be taught anything.' His pupils soon learned to write, at a short notice, Latin verses, which, whatever else they might contain, contained no false quantities. Referring to this time, Pusey would speak of his first schoolmaster as

'a wonderful teacher. He never would allow "cribs." He made us tear out the Latin translations of Homer and Greek writers where we could without destroying the text. He would make us translate a great deal at first sight. Every Sunday we had to write an English theme; and during each week a Latin theme, and a copy of longs and shorts [elegiacs] and of lyrics. Towards the end of my time he made

¹ His father, William Hayward Roberts, had been a Fellow of King's College, Cambridge, assistant master at Eton, Rector of Farnham Royal, Chaplain to the King, and lastly, in 1781, Provost of Eton. His brothers, William and John, were assistant masters and fellows of Eton in due course. Mr. Richard Roberts, on leaving Cambridge, opened a preparatory school at Mitcham, in 1792.

² Among them are the noble names of Auckland, Exeter, Derby, Carlisle,

Ailesbury, Sydney, Somerset, Cowley, Eglinton, Sandwich, Galloway, and Egerton; others were Lord E. Bruce, Lord W. Russell, Lord John Thynne, Sir T. D. Acland, and Mr. Milner Gaskell.

³ Mr. Roberts' portrait, which was in the possession of Dr. Mackarness, late Bishop of Oxford, shows him to have been a kind-hearted man; his methods of governing and teaching schoolboys were in accordance with the best traditions of the day.

me do four copies of Greek verses also every week; I suppose they were Hexameters and Pentameters in the style of the ancient epigrams. In later years when I was in Council¹, and they were talking about the requirements for Little-go and Moderations, I used to say that I knew a school in which half the boys could have passed Moderations—*minus* the Logic-paper—before they were eleven years of age. Perhaps,' he added, 'that was saying a great deal; but they *were* very well prepared.'

'You know,' he used to say to his brother William, 'that either of us could have passed Little-go before we went to Eton.'

Mr. Roberts' boys took high places at Eton almost as a matter of course. However, this was not an unmixed gain: a boy is not commonly the better for being thrown among boys much older than himself, and the hard work at Mitcham was in some cases followed by a period of magnificent idleness, which was of advantage neither to mind nor character.

The Puseys, however, were by inclination and habit industrious boys, although in their case too the motives of fear and ambition may well have had their share of influence. 'When I was eleven years old at school,' Dr. Pusey wrote to his son, 'I was kept to my books, I suppose, more than ten hours a day.' 'Both my boys,' their mother used to say, 'were clever; Philip had more talent, but Edward was the more industrious.'

Among their contemporaries at Mitcham were the late Earl of Derby and his brother, and Lord Carlisle. The latter was younger than either of the Puseys, but, although a very little boy, he had already a reputation for a great power of reading character. Lord Derby was a year or two older than Philip. Lady Lucy Pusey was fond of telling, with a mother's pride, how on one occasion Mr. Roberts, being thoroughly put out by the mistakes or idleness of his pupils, exclaimed in school, 'You are all of you dunces, except the Stanleys and the Puseys.'

Certainly Mr. Roberts must have largely contributed to make Edward Pusey the scholar he became. The sensitive impatience of 'bad scholarship,' which was one of

¹ The Hebdomadal Council of the University of Oxford.

Pusey's characteristics, would not have been so marked without the training and bracing of Mitcham. In later life, accuracy had become to him 'almost a new sense or instinct'¹. The raw material of such a faculty doubtless is God's gift as being part of the original outfit of the human mind; but for its development it is largely dependent upon early guidance and exercise.

It would not appear that Mitcham did anything for Pusey's religious life or convictions. As in most schools of the period, religion was treated as a necessary propriety rather than as a living influence. The boys went to church on Sundays, and prayers were read every morning and evening. But there was no energetic recognition of religion as prescribing motives and governing conduct. The Catechism was learnt, but it was not explained. On Sunday afternoons Mr. Roberts read out to the boys Ostervald's 'Arguments,'—a well-meant but unattractive work on the Bible, which has long since been forgotten². Even a much more interesting book would have failed of its purpose, unless its lessons had been seconded by other methods of making religion at least as much a matter of importance as work or recreation.

Edward Pusey always retained a grateful sense of indebtedness to his first schoolmaster for making him a scholar. When he won the Latin Essay in 1824 he sent Mr. Roberts a copy of it, with an inscription which expressed this in terms which were warmly appreciated³.

He was eleven years and a half old when, with his elder

¹ These words were used of his Greek scholarship by a scholar who had a right to give such an opinion, the late Rev. James Riddell, Fellow and Tutor of Balliol College.

² Ostervald was a Protestant minister at Neuchatel in the early part of the eighteenth century. The object of his 'Arguments' is to give a general idea of the contents of the Bible, and to connect this with lessons of practical religion. Each chapter of the Bible is epitomized, and the epitome is followed by reflections. Epitomes rarely succeed, and, least of all, epitomes of

the Bible.

³ The inscription runs thus: 'The Rev. R. Roberts, with E. B. P.'s best respects and regards, and in grateful remembrance—actae non alio rege puertiae.' Horace was thinking of the meeting of two friends in later life who had had the same master; Pusey mainly of his old master, but not without a thought of his brother Philip, with whom his school life was throughout associated. The copy of this inscription is due to the kindness of Bishop Mackarness.

brother, he was sent to Eton. The boys arrived there on January 16, 1812. They were placed in the house of the Rev. Thomas Carter¹; and they found a friend in their first cousin², whose services in those bewildering hours of entrance on the strange scene of public school life were always gratefully recalled³.

The Eton to which the boys were thus introduced was the Eton of Dr. Keate. He had already been Head Master for three years: his reign covered a quarter of a century.

'On the 13th of May, 1813,' writes the late Rev. Edward Coleridge, 'I found myself sitting on the *same* bench with E. B. P. (in the lower division of the fifth form) with Jelf⁴ next boy to him, and between him and me, Luxmoore⁵, his future brother-in-law; Moultrie⁶; Law, now Dean of Gloucester; Eden⁷, afterwards Bishop of Bath and Wells; A. M. Wale, still Vicar of Sunning Hill. . . . In 1817 I was in the sixth form, with E. B. P. as the third oppidan. During this time I, a col-
leger, knew little of him except that he did not engage in sports, did long exercises, and was very obscure in his style. My intimacy with him, and my love for him, were of later date⁸.'

In those years the fifth form at Eton contained an unusually large number of boys who were destined to become remarkable men; and of these not a few had come from Mitcham. Among them were a Prime Minister⁹, a Lord Lieutenant of Ireland¹⁰, a Colonial Minister and First Lord of the Admiralty¹¹, a Chancellor of the Duchy

¹ Afterwards Vice-Provost. Mr. Carter had been an assistant master since 1801; he became Lower Master in 1814. As the father of the Rev. T. T. Carter, his name will be reverently cherished by all English Churchmen; and visitors to Eton will not forget the window in the ante-chapel which expresses the love and gratitude of his children.

² Robert Sherard, sixth and last Earl of Harborough, was born 26th August, 1797, and succeeded to the title on Dec. 10, 1807.

³ On Lord Harborough's death Pusey wrote to his brother: 'I remember him in his young days as a boy at Eton, when Philip and I first went there. . . . He was very kind to us, as an experienced and older boy could be. I often have wished that I could be of any use to him.

I prayed for him by name for years.'

⁴ Richard William Jelf, afterwards Fellow of Oriel; Canon of Christ Church; and Principal of King's College, London.

⁵ John Henry Montague Luxmoore, who married Miss Elizabeth Bouverie Pusey.

⁶ Rev. John Moultrie, Rector of Rugby, and a friend of Arnold.

⁷ Afterwards Lord Auckland.

⁸ Rev. Edward Coleridge to Rev. T. T. Carter, Oct. 20, 1882. Mr. Coleridge died at his rectory of Mapledurham, aged 83, on May 18, 1883, just eight months after Dr. Pusey.

⁹ Mr. Stanley, afterwards Earl of Derby.

¹⁰ Mr. Howard, afterwards Earl of Carlisle.

¹¹ Mr. John Somerset Russell, after-

of Lancaster¹, a Treasurer of the Household², a Speaker of the House of Commons³, three Ambassadors⁴, and others who by force of character or in virtue of their position were well known in after life⁵.

Pusey had many acquaintances at Eton, but few friends. The future Lord Derby he regarded as having 'an iron will and unbounded self-confidence⁶.' Of the three embryo bishops who were with him in the fifth—James Chapman⁷, Robert John Eden⁸, and Edward Denison⁹—he knew the latter best, but none intimately. He used to refer from time to time to Henry Nelson Coleridge, to John Moultrie, and especially to a younger boy at that time in the fourth form, whose poems, however, it is probable he never read in the busy years of manhood—Winthrop Mackworth Praed, with whom he used constantly to play chess. Two boys there were whose characters might have seemed to mark them out as his natural friends, but of whose relations with him it is difficult to discover distinct traces—J. J. Hornby, who was no unworthy successor of Sherlock in the Rectory of Winwick, and the Hon. George Spencer, who a quarter of a century afterwards passed at a bound from extreme Evangelicalism into the Roman Church, but whose memory can never be recalled without reverence and affection by any who had the happiness of knowing him. With Germain Lavie, who was his senior, with the two brothers Neave, with Mr. John Parker of Sweeney, and, in a different sense, with Julian Hibbert, Pusey was constantly corresponding during the ten years that followed his Eton life.

wards Sir John Pakington, and finally Lord Hampton.

¹ Duke of Montrose.

² Marquis of Bristol.

³ John Evelyn Denison, afterwards Viscount Ossington.

⁴ Lord Howard de Walden; Sir John Duncan Bligh; Mr. John Hobart Cradock.

⁵ Such as Sir T. F. Fremantle, afterwards Lord Cottesloe; Mr. Twistleton, afterwards Lord Saye and Sele; Mr. William Ewart; Lord Por-

chester, afterwards third Earl of Carnarvon.

⁶ Pusey to Keble, on the Oxford Chancellorship, before Easter, 1864. It is possible that Pusey's judgment may have been coloured by his strong feeling about Lord Stanley's contribution towards suppressing the Irish Bishops in 1833.

⁷ First Bishop of Colombo.

⁸ Bishop of Bath and Wells.

⁹ Bishop of Salisbury.

His greatest friend at Eton was the Hon. Edward Charles Hugh Herbert, whose elder brother, Lord Porchester, was on terms of equal intimacy with Philip Pusey. The friendship was brought about by an incident which discovered a prominent feature of Pusey's character. Young Herbert had made some remark, which led another boy to say jestingly, 'What would your mother say?'—upon which Herbert burst into tears. On Pusey's going up to him he discovered that Herbert's mother, Lady Carnarvon, to whom he had been tenderly attached, had lately died¹, and Pusey's tender and delicate sympathy was never forgotten. When Mr. Herbert died, almost suddenly, on Whit Sunday, 1852, Pusey wrote to his sister that 'nothing is sudden to one who is always ready: and all which he has ever said to me bespoke a mind which was ready for the change.' When eighteen years later Mr. Herbert's son was murdered by brigands on the field of Marathon², the tragedy woke up in Pusey's mind all his tender affections for his old school-fellow; had it been his own son—it was observed—he could hardly have been more distressed.

Another Eton boy to whom, throughout life, Pusey would very often refer in terms of great affection, but from whom, in his latter years, he was entirely separated, was Henry Law, afterwards Dean of Gloucester. The Dean writes:

'We were in the same form, and I have a most lively recollection of his appearance and general habits. He was rather junior to me in age. His appearance was that of a weakly delicate boy. He was remarkably quiet and retiring. He manifested a kindly feeling towards myself, and I think he preferred me as a companion to any other boy. But he was very grave and thoughtful, and I cannot recollect that he ever joined in any of our sports. I did not perceive in him at that time much promise of future celebrity³.'

There is little to be said about Pusey's reading while at

¹ March 5, 1813.

² Mr. Edward Henry Charles Herbert was murdered May 21, 1870.

³ Mr. Law left Eton before Pusey left it. Pusey wrote to him often when he was at Cambridge. They met for the last time at Bath, of which

place Mr. Law was rector: but their old intimacy was wrecked on serious differences as to religious belief. When discussion does not compel agreement, it may only show that a difference of major premises makes agreement impossible.

Eton, except that he worked steadily. He told his brother William, while the latter was still a schoolboy, and in order to encourage him, that on one occasion, when laid up at Eton by a bad foot, he had read through Xenophon's 'Anabasis' for amusement in bed in less than a week. He did not begin mathematics until he had left Eton; 'but then,' he adds, 'I read them by myself, and scarcely knew their importance.' He always regretted that when at school he 'had not been obliged to work hard at mathematics.' 'Of what is called divinity'—so he writes in 1826—'of the contents, historical and doctrinal, of the Bible, and of any illustrations of them,—Eton boys are generally shamefully ignorant.'

In looking back to his Eton days Pusey would refer to them in varying terms. On one occasion, at any rate, he described them as 'not the happiest in my life.' At other times he certainly spoke of himself as very happy while at Eton. Such apparent contradictions are easily reconciled: the one phrase may refer to a single episode, the other to the general tenor of his life. He was a weakly boy; and often found himself unequal to taking his natural part in games. But he was as popular as a shy boy could be: older boys knew that he was no 'loafer'; and when he felt unwell he could always get off 'fagging cricket,' which appears to have tired him greatly. But, on the other hand, he was well known to ride better than most boys; and he was a good swimmer. Once he was nearly drowned while bathing. He was apparently dead when taken out of the water; it is supposed that he had an attack of cramp. Whenever he wanted to suggest to another how easy it might be to die, he would refer to the experience of becoming insensible on this occasion as 'very delightful¹.' However, he seems to have cared less for outdoor exercise when at school than as an Oxford undergraduate: he had moreover the reputation of being the best chess-player at Eton.

¹ The witnesses of this event have passed away. I have been unable to recover any account of it from Pusey's

contemporaries. It may have taken place during the holidays; but this is improbable.

The years which he spent at school were years of no common importance to England and to Europe. To the Puseys, as to other boys of that generation, Bonaparte had been the spectre of early childhood: and they were now old enough to understand something of the significance of his downfall. Their Eton life began some time before the advance to Moscow; it did not close until more than a year after Waterloo. If ever events could take possession of the imagination, inspire purpose, and give strength and shape to character, the defeat and captivity of the great French Captain was surely well fitted to do this; especially in the case of Eton lads, who, for the most part, had been accustomed to hear public matters discussed by their parents, and to look forward to a career of public activity for themselves. Most boys make an effort at times to understand what is passing in the world in which they will presently have to play their parts; and when a number of young Englishmen are thrown together at a great crisis in the history of their country, the interchange of information, of apprehension, of conjecture, of hope and fear, of all that belongs to the wisdom, the enthusiasm, or even the folly of the time, has its effect on after-life. In the case of several Eton boys of that day these critical years may be traced in their effects on a public career: in Edward Pusey they contributed to develop that sense of the Presence of God in human affairs, as attested by swift and awful judgments, which coloured so largely his religious convictions¹. When, thirty years after, he had retired from society altogether, and was living, as men said, the life of a recluse, he kept his eye on the political events of the time. 'We may see

¹ 'Minor Prophets,' p. 256, Int. to Jonah: 'The older of us remember what awful joy was felt, when after three days of mortal strife at Leipzig, in which 107,000 were killed or wounded, victory at length was won; or when out of 647,000 men who swept across Europe (a mass larger than the whole population of Nineveh) only 85,000 escaped.' Compare the

striking passage in 'Chastisements neglected the forerunners of greater,' preached on the Eve of the Annunciation, 1847; Oxford, 1859, 3rd ed. p. 11. The present writer can never forget Pusey's solemn reference to the campaigns of Leipzig and Waterloo, in a Hebrew lecture more than forty years ago: he was commenting on Psalm xxxvii. 37.

perhaps,' he said, 'what God is doing, if we do not know what He means to do.'

It is difficult to trace any special characteristic of Pusey's religious life to the Eton system¹. There were, of course, the prayers in chapel, some religious lessons, and a clerical staff of masters; and these could not have been without their effect on a thoughtful boy. But at the beginning of the century the Church had no adequate idea of the splendid opportunities which Divine Providence still offered her in the public schools of this country. Pusey never referred to Eton, within the present writer's memory, as having been of religious advantage to him: but, on the other hand, except in the important particular of religious instruction, he did not complain of it as deficient².

About a year before the close of his Eton career Pusey was confirmed in the Chapel Royal, St. James's, by Dr. Howley, then Bishop of London³. Of his special preparation for that solemn moment in a Christian's life, and for his first Communion, no record remains. Yet it is known that while at Eton he led a blameless life, and that he never omitted the prayers which his mother had taught him. Moreover, before Pusey had left Eton he was regarded amongst his friends as the natural guide of the younger boys. At any

¹ In a letter to Rev. W. B. Pusey, dated May 5, 1845, Lady Lucy Pusey writes: 'I have been occupying myself of an evening lately in destroying most of my letters and papers, to save trouble to those who would come after. Reading over some I had preserved of Edward's, I could see in him the same character in early youth that he has now, especially in some he wrote to me from Eton upon his receiving the Sacrament, and upon the death of one of his schoolfellows in Mr. Carter's house.'

² Among the assistant masters at Eton from 1802 to 1816 was the Rev. John Bird Sumner, afterwards Bishop of Chester and Archbishop of Canterbury. He spent his leisure in visiting the sick poor in Windsor and Eton, and was greatly respected. But apparently he had no direct religious influence upon the boys. In the heat

of the Gorham controversy, Pusey incurred some censure among his friends by insisting 'on what is the simple truth, that Sumner has all along been labouring to advance piety. Such was his character at Eton thirty-six years ago, and I suppose earlier.'

³ In the last year of his life Pusey had to advise his niece, Mrs. Fletcher, as to whether her son, then going to Eton for the first time, should be confirmed or not. 'I would not hurry it,' he said; 'I was at Eton several years before I was confirmed.' At other times he expressed the opinion that Confirmation should be earlier or later than the usual age of fifteen or sixteen; earlier that it might furnish the grace to resist temptation at a perilous time of life, or later that it might seal repentance for the sins of an undisciplined youth.

rate the subjoined letter from his schoolfellow, Mr. R. W. Jelf, who had preceded him to Oxford, if a little didactic, as is sometimes the manner of big boys and young men, is honourable to both of them :—

RICHARD W. JELF, ESQ., TO E. B. P.

Twickenham Meadows,

Oct. 14, 1817.

MY DEAR PUSEY,

You will, I dare say, be surprised at seeing my handwriting again after so long a separation. The truth is, I should not have troubled you with this, but for a particular friend, who requested me to put a little commission into the hands of any one at Eton whom I can depend upon. Now, I know no one who will be more able, and I trust more willing, to execute this than yourself; and I am the more encouraged to this from knowing the high situation you at present bear in the school. There is a boy of the name of Estridge at Holt's, and if it is in your power I know you will patronize him. I understand he is a boy of good abilities, but being born to a large fortune he is, I believe, a little inclined to amuse himself at the expense of his studies, and it is therefore of the first importance to his future welfare that he should be set in a good way at his entrance into a public school. Will you have the goodness to send for him and, without seeming to know that he is thus inclined, give him a little good advice in a kind way; particularly caution him against shooting, &c.? This dose of admonition it will be well to wash down with some little kindnesses, such as a few liberties, &c., and I know I leave both the bane and the antidote in good hands.

Having thus far discharged my trust, I am glad to have an opportunity of expressing my wish that you would enter into a regular correspondence with me; as regular, at least, as is consistent with my usual want of punctuality. Pray write soon, directing to me at Ch. Ch., Oxford, where I return on Friday. Tell me what you can of your new protégé, and then give me a full account of everything at Eton, society, sixth form, &c., &c. I shall expect you soon at Ch. Ch., where I think I can introduce you to a good acquaintance. I am very happy there in every way; surrounded with friends and possessed of every comfort. . . .

Your very sincere friend,

R. W. JELF.

Tuesday.

This letter, however, although sent to Eton, had to be re-addressed. On the last Saturday of July, 1817, at Election, Edward Pusey had closed the five years and a half of his public school life, and had gone to a private tutor.

In October, 1817, Pusey was placed by his father under the care of the Rev. Edward Maltby, D.D., Vicar of Buckden, near Huntingdon, and prebendary of Leighton Buzzard in Lincoln Cathedral. Dr. Maltby had distinguished himself at Cambridge in scholarship¹; and to the end of his life he was before all things a scholar. He was fond of remembering that Porson had been kind to him; and he in turn liked the society of younger students; helped them with his advice and his money; and, when he could do so, recommended them for assistance to the Government of the day. He gave much time and labour to scholastic publications²; nor was he indeed forgetful of subjects which have a stronger claim upon a clergyman³. But, in truth, Maltby, though an excellent scholar, was in no serious sense a theologian: his interest was almost entirely confined to the textual or literary aspects of the Sacred Books, where, to use his own words, he found 'ample employment in that course of reading to which his mind had been more peculiarly directed.' The Evangelicals of the day vigorously attacked his sermons⁴ and other publications⁵. Maltby on his side never liked that party; and although he denounced the Tractarians in later years, he was careful to explain that he was 'not a party man.' His

¹ He was born at Norwich in 1770; educated at Winchester and Pembroke College, Cambridge, where he graduated as eighth wrangler in 1792. He gained the prize medals for Greek Odes in 1790 and 1791, and was Chancellor's Medallist in 1792.

² In obedience, he says, to an injunction of Porson's, he published in 1815 an enlarged and corrected edition of Morell's 'Lexicon for Greek Prosody,' after devoting eleven years to the labour of re-editing it. He is better known by his 'Gradus ad Parnassum,' a work with which most schoolboys who have had to make Greek lambics are more or less familiar. This well-known book reached a third edition in 1851.

³ In 1802 he published 'Illustrations of the Truth of the Christian Religion.' A second edition followed

in 1803. This work was recommended by Bishop Tomline, and welcomed in a very different quarter. Cf. Cunningham's 'Observations designed as a Reply to the "Thoughts" of Dr. Maltby.' London, 1812, p. 1.

⁴ A volume of Dr. Maltby's sermons appeared in 1819; it was reviewed eleven years later in the *Christian Observer*, when the author was made a Bishop; cf. vol. xxxi. p. 556, Sept., 1831. The *Monthly Review* (vol. xci. pp. 300 sqq., March, 1820) had reviewed it with enthusiasm. A second volume appeared in 1822, and a third nine years afterwards.

⁵ 'Thoughts on the Utility and Expediency of the Plans proposed by the Bible Society,' by Edward Maltby, D.D. London, Cadell, 1812.

'Evangelical' opponents, however, could not prevent his elevation in the year 1831 to the Episcopal Bench¹. As a Bishop, his language and conduct were in entire consistency with the kindness, the munificence, the love of learning², the Whig politics and the doctrinal latitudinarianism³ of his earlier life.

The Puseys were sent to Buckden by their father on account of Dr. Maltby's classical reputation; and the year and three months which Edward Pusey spent there were not without their influence on his future career. Unlike his elder brother⁴, he recalled with satisfaction his life at Buckden. Maltby, he used to say, was a hard worker, and he made his pupils work; and while he inspired them with an enthusiasm for scholarship, they could not but enjoy the sunshine of his kindly benevolence. Probably, too, the greater opportunities for long hours of uninterrupted reading were increasingly welcome to a lad who was now forming the habits of a serious student. When in later years Dr. Maltby's name was mentioned, Pusey's face would light up, 'Ah! he was a scholar of the old painstaking kind.' In the course of fifteen months Pusey was led or accompanied by his tutor through the larger part of the text of the poets and historians who, at that time, were taken in by candidates for Classical Honours at Oxford: and the assistance thus given, if too much fashioned on Porson's model always to command the approval of a ripened

¹ He became Bishop of Chichester in 1831, and was translated to Durham, on the recommendation of Lord Melbourne, in 1836.

² He bequeathed his fine library to the University of Durham. It was undoubtedly richer in scholarship and general literature than in theology. The only work of Pusey's which it contained was the 'Theology of Germany'; cf. 'Catalogus Bibliothecae Maltbeianae in Universitate Dunelmensi.' Londini, Mitchell, 1863.

³ Thus he subscribed to a Socinian chapel, and to a volume of sermons published by a Socinian minister in his diocese; cf. *The Times*, Oct. 10 and 13, 1838; also 'Letters to the

Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Durham, relative to his Lordship's subscription to a volume of sermons by the Rev. W. Turner, Newcastle-on-Tyne.' London, Green, 1838.

⁴ In his later years Philip Pusey expressed a prejudice against private tutors. 'School,' he said, 'is good, and home is good, but not these establishments.' In this opinion his brother Edward by no means concurred. He was 'always very happy with Maltby; there were no black sheep at Buckden'; and he 'could not account for his brother's feeling. Philip may have had something in his mind of which he knew nothing.'

Oxford judgment, was often gratefully referred to as 'solid and judicious.' But Dr. Maltby was not the man to guide or even to detect the early workings of a religious mind. He himself conceived of religion mainly as the outcome of one branch of literature; and his idea of the nature and purpose of Christianity¹ was too thin and meagre to affect anybody else, unless it should be by giving an impulse towards negative speculations. It has been conjectured that in fact Maltby did influence Pusey in this way; and that certain features of the 'Theology of Germany' may be traced to Buckden. For this opinion, however, there is no adequate ground; Pusey never referred to him as among those to whom he was indebted for any religious guidance in early life. He went to Buckden for scholarship: and while he was well aware of the drift of Dr. Maltby's theological opinions, his own religious faith and practice was at this period of his life still in the main what he had learned from his mother, with such enlargement or modification as the experience or needs of school life might have suggested.

From time to time Pusey had communications with his former tutor. Maltby wrote him a warm letter of congratulation on his first class and his Oriel Fellowship; thanked him for his kindness to a nephew; bespoke his father's interest for the destitute family of a deceased clergyman; and pressed him to revisit Buckden.

Eighteen years passed, and Pusey's tutor was now Bishop of Durham; Tract 90 had been published; and Pusey himself had already filled the Regius chair of Hebrew at Oxford during twelve eventful years. Bishop Maltby, after the fashion of the day, had been charging his clergy against the Tractarians², but more moderately than some other prelates, and, it may be added, in those vague and general terms which are perhaps natural when a clever man discusses a subject with which he is conscious of being imperfectly acquainted. The Bishop explained that he had

¹ Cf. 'Sermons,' i. p. 319 (ed. 1819).

² 'Charge delivered to the Diocese

of Durham, by Edward, Lord Bishop of Durham.' London, T. Cadell, 1841.

had no intercourse with 'the able writers' whom he thus criticized, 'excepting indeed one distinguished individual, of whom as a former pupil I have no recollections but such as are most agreeable.' The charge, however, contained some matter of a different character, and Pusey wrote to complain of 'the severe and unmitigated censure' of the Oxford School. The Bishop could not allow that his language ought to be so described, but he really appears to have been unable even to understand Pusey's point of view: and he hastens to adopt 'that tone of familiarity and confidence with which an old tutor may address an old and much-esteemed pupil.' He thanks Pusey for the 'spirit' of his letter. 'Although,' he concludes, 'we so unfortunately differ at present in our opinions, I shall always be glad to receive you as an old friend¹.'

This was Pusey's last communication with his former tutor. Bishop Maltby resigned the See of Durham in September, 1856; and died at his house in Portland Place on July 3, 1859, at the ripe age of eighty-nine. Pusey never referred to him without a good word for 'Maltby's scholarship,' and would hold his tongue or change the subject when Maltby's relation to graver matters was discussed.

Six months before Pusey left Buckden, an event occurred of great moment to his future life. He was spending some weeks at home, when he met for the first time Miss Maria Catharine Barker, the youngest daughter of John Raymond Barker, Esq., of Fairford Park, Gloucestershire².

¹ That Pusey's remonstrance was not without effect may perhaps be inferred from Bishop Maltby's later Charge in 1845. Controversy had then become much hotter than was the case in 1841, but the Bishop confined himself to warning his clergy against 'extreme views' and 'the revival of dormant customs,' while in his Appendix he oddly quoted a passage from Hagenbach ('Church History of the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries,' part 2, pp. 410, 411), accounting for the Oxford movement as the 'cold and dry result of a rigid and unbroken hierarchy.' 'Charge to Clergy of Diocese of Dur-

ham in September, 1845.' London, Bohn, p. 26, note A on p. 6.

² The Barkers were an old Shropshire family who had purchased Fairford from the Tracys at the date of the Restoration. The last surviving member of the family, Esther, the widow of James Lamb, Esq., had bequeathed the Fairford property to John Raymond, Esq., who assumed the name and arms of Barker, had twelve children by his first wife, and two, of whom Mrs. Edward Pusey was the youngest, by his second. Mr. Pusey's account-book shows that at this date the Barkers and Puseys

Pusey had nearly reached his eighteenth birthday, and Miss Barker was just seventeen. Besides the attraction of her good looks, she was undoubtedly accomplished; while her character, although as yet very unformed, combined, with elements of impulsiveness and self-will, qualities of very rare beauty, which Pusey believed himself to have discerned from the first and instinctively. He did not at first suspect the strength, or indeed the nature, of the feeling which she had provoked in him. 'It was my brother Philip,' he wrote to her in after years, 'who first discovered to myself my attachment to you in 1818. . . . I was no free agent (unless principle bade me stop) after I had seen you. . . . Everything has been the necessary consequence of that.' He does not appear to have seen her more than once before returning for his last three months of residence at Buckden; but he carried with him 'a new interest which made life unlike anything it had ever been to him before.' Nine years were to pass before his wishes could be realized; and, as will be seen, these years of alternating hope and disappointment were destined to exert a serious effect upon his character.

In January, 1819, Edward Pusey went up to Christ Church, which was then under the rule of Dean Hall, but was still thriving upon the great traditions of Cyril Jackson's administration¹. Among the Canons were Van Mildert, who was Regius Professor of Divinity², and Lawrence, who filled the chair of Hebrew³. Lloyd, afterwards Bishop of Oxford, and Pusey's friend and patron, stood ninth on the list of students; Fynes Clinton, the chronologist, was a younger Master of Arts; while Longley, the future primate, and Burton, Van Mildert's successor, were Bachelors of Arts.

were in the habit of exchanging yearly visits; Fairford Park and Pusey were, however, only fifteen miles distant from each other.

¹ Dean Cyril Jackson probably raised Christ Church to its greatest height of educational efficiency and social influence. He was at once the intimate friend of Cabinet Ministers

and of undergraduates; and he showed how much an unmarried head of a House, with a powerful understanding, great social tact, and, above all, singleness of purpose, can do for a great foundation. On his resignation in 1809 he was succeeded by Dean Hall.

² Afterwards Bishop of Durham.

³ He died Archbishop of Cashel.

The undergraduate world of Christ Church contained its full share of names which were destined for distinction in after-life: among them may be mentioned, as in different senses related to Pusey's own career, Lord Porchester, Lord Ashley, Lord Sandon; Walter Farquhar Hook, R. W. Jelf, C. C. Clerke, Edward Churton, Frederick Oakeley, and Richard Salwey. The Rev. Thomas Vowler Short, who died Bishop of St. Asaph, was Pusey's tutor; and among the several teachers to whom Pusey felt indebted for moral guidance and mental training, Short held a first place in his affection and respect to the last hour of his life. Whenever the value of the old religious system of the University was unduly depreciated by the New Liberalism that was bent on destroying it, Pusey would point to 'Short, my old tutor,' as a proof that the most efficient assistance in preparing for the Schools might be combined with higher influences of lasting power. No dedication of a book was ever less the language of conventionalism than that which Pusey prefixed to the second volume of his *Parochial Sermons*¹. Pusey's still extant but fragmentary notes on Mr. Short's Divinity lectures in 1821 show that these lectures had been carefully prepared, and that they must have been marked by depth and reverence; and Bishop Short's 'faithful friendship and fatherly and episcopal kindness' were not less prized by his old pupil than his 'religious instruction and earnest practical teaching.' If the Bishop of St. Asaph could not always adopt the language of the Oxford School, he did not allow popular controversy to beguile him into forgetfulness of the duties which the understanding owes to learning, and the heart to high and disinterested characters: and he stood by Pusey more than once at a time when to do so implied no little courage in a ruler of the Church.

Pusey does not appear to have had many intimate friends

¹ It appeared in 1852: 'To the Right Rev. Thomas Vowler, Lord Bishop of St. Asaph, . . . in grateful acknowledgment of benefits received in youth from his earnest practical

teaching and religious instruction, of his faithful friendship amidst advancing years, and of his fatherly and episcopal kindness until now. . . .'

among his Christ Church contemporaries. This was due partly to his state of health, partly to his natural shyness, and still more to the pre-occupation of his thoughts which his attachment to Miss Barker involved. He was in no sense unpopular; but he lived on the edge of general society rather than in it. Pusey's undergraduate friends were all, or almost all, old Eton acquaintances. Among these his cousin, Lord Ashley (afterwards the well-known Earl of Shaftesbury), claims prominent mention. Their friendship was however checked by one of those apparently trifling circumstances in early life which often have far-reaching results. Lord Ashley wished to read for lectures with Pusey; and Pusey, probably for no other reason than a belief that he would get through his work better by himself, declined. Another and more intimate friend, with whom however Pusey might have seemed to have less in common, was John Parker, of Sweeney Hall, near Shrewsbury. They had been boys together at Eton; but Parker had gone up to Oriel a year before Pusey left Buckden, and accordingly greeted Pusey on his arrival at Oxford with the imposing authority of an older undergraduate. Parker was enterprising and discursive; too discursive to be persuaded by the Oriel tutors to read steadily for Honours. But his industrious habits, his knowledge of recondite subjects, his imagination and sympathy, directed by an amusing egotism, made him a useful, as he was certainly a kind, friend to Edward Pusey. Parker was much busied in elaborating an ambitious theory which he called the 'classic system,' a theory of life, art, and literature, the principles and details of which he constantly expounded to his friends. The 'classic system' appears to have prescribed an application of the Horatian metres to the Psalter, and even the versification of sermons. It undertook to regulate feeling and to repress emotions which could not appeal to classical models. It was especially concerned to uphold the statuesque purity of language. But the world of art was to be the main scene of its activity; here Parker saw boundless visions of possible

improvement. When in 1821 he took leave of Oxford, he wandered out to the hill above Hinksey, and

‘from thence looking down upon Oxford in the distance and remembering a multitude of things together, felt more sadness than almost ever before.’ ‘I suppose,’ he continues, ‘I must add, not more sadness than is in harmony with the “classic system.”’

Describing his ordination as priest in St. Asaph’s Cathedral in 1823, he writes:—

‘If any *peculiar* feeling existed in my mind upon this occasion, it was a determination to blend religion and the fine arts together, in thought and practice—a feeling which I hardly care to avow to you, because I am afraid you may esteem it an unworthy one. But I acknowledge no error in it, for under such a conviction I would gladly die. Let my maxim always be, “Virtue,—Beauty.”’ ‘It is easy,’ he warns Edward Pusey, ‘to write moderate English, but far from easy to write it finely. I am sorry to say that almost the only man who writes English with purity, though he is frequently vulgar, is that infamous William Cobbett.’

Edward Pusey seems to have abandoned art altogether to Parker’s discretion. But he openly rebelled against Parker’s theories of the functions of versification, and he certainly offered a dogged if silent and perhaps mistaken resistance to his purism in the matter of style¹.

A third and still more intimate friend of Pusey’s undergraduate life was R. W. Jelf. Jelf took his degree at Easter, 1820, when his name appears in the Second Class—a decoration which his contemporaries held to be less than he deserved. Pusey’s letter to him on the occasion is still extant: he accounts for the failure by Jelf’s having

¹ When in 1828 Pusey sent Parker a copy of his ‘Theology in Germany,’ the latter replied, ‘I will carefully read it and criticize the style, as that is the only part where my opinion would be of use to you.’ In his later life Mr. Parker was chiefly interested in architecture. In 1823 Bishop Heber, then leaving England for Calcutta, induced him to prepare several designs for churches in India. As Rector of Llanmarewic, in Montgomeryshire, and afterwards as Vicar of Llan-y-Blodwell, in Shropshire, Mr. Parker

has left abundant proof of his interest in art as well as of his personal generosity. As years went on, the ‘classic system’ was so far modified as to make room for the architecture of the thirteenth century. He died Aug. 13, 1860. See an interesting obituary notice in the *Gentleman’s Magazine*, Dec. 1860, pp. 675–678. Latterly the two friends appear to have communicated very rarely with each other, but there is no evidence of any change of feeling on either side.

been put on in a passage of Livy which he had not read. Jelf wished Pusey to join him in a foreign tour; but this, Pusey says, would not be sanctioned by his father.

‘I do not know,’ he writes, ‘how far the intermixture with the vices and dissipation of a foreign country would appear to him [my father] salutary to that tenor of mind which he would wish me to maintain. I am aware that in [from] this avowal many would extract much pleasantry on the fancied rigidity of my father or my apparent constraint; but while I know that his principal exertion, every wish, is directed to the furtherance of our happiness, *non me poeniteat sanum patris hujus.*’

The letter, it must be owned, is rather stilted: as the letters of young men often are when they are not ostentatiously free and easy. Pusey goes on to refer with sincere distress to his own ‘morbid feelings’ about Fairford and Miss Barker; and he advises his friend to ‘engage a companion of livelier spirits, more engaging manners, and more certain in his prospects, than him whom your proposals have so much obliged.’ He concludes in giving the history of a college prize, together with a burst of enthusiasm about Eton.

Although Pusey’s father did not, at this date, approve of a foreign tour, yet he did not disallow a visit to Wales in Jelf’s company. The two friends left Oxford in June, 1820, and spent six or seven weeks together very pleasantly. The tour was prematurely cut short at Dolgelly by a letter from home, which told Edward Pusey that his elder brother was on the point of starting for Spain. He therefore hastened to Shrewsbury, where he left Jelf with his friend Parker, and then hurried home.

Young men at college are generally politicians; and Edward Pusey was a Whig, if not a Liberal. This phase of opinion may have been partly due to Dr. Maltby’s influence, partly a reaction from the stern Toryism which reigned at Pusey, but it was mainly the work of his elder brother, whose earlier bias had been confirmed by his engagement in 1819 to Lady Emily Herbert. The House of Carnarvon was at that time on the Whig side in politics. Lord Carnarvon spoke frequently from the Liberal benches

in the House of Lords ; he warmly espoused the cause of Queen Caroline ; and his efforts on her behalf were so unwelcome to Mr. Pusey, senior, that, as has been said, he long objected to his eldest son's engagement to Lady Emily Herbert. The younger Philip Pusey's Liberal opinions, besides being strengthened by his affections, were reinforced by his intimacy with Lord Porchester, his constant companion, both at home and in travel abroad ; and the two brother Puseys, so far as their deference for their father would allow, raised the standard of a Liberal rebellion in the most Tory of households. Their enthusiasm for Queen Caroline was very irritating to Jelf.

'The Queen is dead,' he wrote to Edward Pusey in August, 1821. 'How you Whigs will lament, not for her death, but for the destruction of those hopes which through her would have offered the seals of office to Lord Grey for the third time ! . . . But I spare you.'

After the lapse of a year, Pusey's father had modified or withdrawn his objections to foreign travel, and in the Long Vacation of 1821 Pusey went abroad for the first time. He went to Paris alone to meet his brother on the first return of the latter from Spain. On his way he stopped at Beauvais and wrote an enthusiastic account of the cathedral to John Parker. He was struck with the 'universal smile' on the French faces, and contrasted it with the serious gloom of Englishmen. During his visits to the Paris churches, he saw some crucifixes upon which he commented unfavourably in a letter to Jelf. This afforded the latter an opportunity for rallying him on his political feeling in favour of Roman Catholic emancipation. Jelf congratulated him on having 'drawn the full moral from the French crucifixes.'

'I doubt not,' he added, 'that the disgusting reality has weaned you from the arms of theoretical emancipation, and restored you to the bosom of your good old Protestant mother Church. . . . The absurd appetite for ultra-toleration is one degree only removed from schism.'

The Coronation of George IV. during Pusey's absence from England gave him an opportunity for airing his

somewhat vehement Liberalism. 'Although,' he wrote to Mr. Salwey,

'Jelf in his Tory enthusiasm describes the coronation as "the most splendid and perfect spectacle that mortal eye could behold, one in which the days of chivalry came sweeping by one, &c., &c.," I confess that the scene [would have] had no attractions for me. Unless viewed in the light of a king pledging himself in the presence of his subjects to the performance of his duty, it is an unsubstantial pageant, which leaves not a rack behind, and even then the theatre is ill-chosen, where only those who understand the emptiness of the proceeding can attend to witness it. . . .

'I thought myself far better employed in revelling amid the glories of Raphael and Titian, and studying the dying gladiator (who, I have at least learnt, ought not to be called so), at Paris. Cathedrals, churches, theatres, museums, libraries, filled up every moment I had there, and left impressions, "*quae nunc perscribere longum est.*" I was unhappily too late for the Chamber of Deputies. I would have given worlds to have heard the plea which was made for liberty. . . . But they are so nauseated with having drunk the dregs of Freedom's cup, that they now abhor the taste. . . . In fact they are slaves, and willing ones.'

The brothers seem to have enjoyed themselves in Paris, but Edward Pusey returned hastily in consequence of news from home which touched him nearly. The passage was a rough one. The packet instead of reaching Dover was carried down Channel; a landing at Brighton was in vain attempted, and Pusey only got ashore at Southampton. When he reached home he found to his great distress that, while his family had become fully aware of his feelings towards Miss Barker, his father and mother both viewed the attachment with marked disfavour. In Mr. Pusey's eyes it was a passing gust of youthful passion, which would die away if no opportunities were afforded for feeding the flame. He accordingly forbade all intercourse between his son and Miss Barker. The effect on Edward Pusey was very serious. He was for the moment plunged in the deepest despair. He thought of giving up reading for his degree and leaving Oxford. He even had some dismal apprehensions that he would lose his reason. A gloom had indeed already settled on him since the beginning of his attachment; and in anticipation of its being discouraged by his father, Lady Lucy Pusey had from time to

time prepared him, by gentle hints, for what was coming. But when the storm broke, his previous depression became a settled melancholy, which overclouded his life until the summer of 1827. Of this period he afterwards wrote :—

‘Never did I feel any disposition, or make any effort, to be gay. It seemed to me unnatural ; I loved my grief better than any hollow joy ; and if my mother in society, when I occasionally forgot myself, expressed to me her pleasure at seeing me smile, it invariably brought again a gloom over my countenance.’

But matters would have been, humanly speaking, much worse, had it not been for the support and counsels of Edward Pusey’s sensible and affectionate friend, Richard Jelf, whose letters written at this period were carefully preserved. They are remarkable for sympathy, tact, insight, strong common sense, and true religious feeling. Pusey was at last persuaded that even to think of losing his mind was to lose trust in God ; that to read for his degree was at once an immediate duty and an opportune distraction ; and that if he would only wait and hope, matters might even yet be better with him.

It was to be expected that his health, which was always delicate, would suffer from this strain. For a week at least he seems to have broken down entirely ; he could not write consecutively to his friends. He suffered constantly from violent headaches, and Dr. Kidd, whom he consulted, told him that they might not improbably last throughout his life. However, he returned to Oxford with a determination to bury himself in his books. He had read pretty steadily from the beginning of his Oxford life ; but during the first two years, as he had his own horse, he rode a great deal, and at one time hunted three times a week, but without neglecting his reading. He would never miss a meet in the direction of Fairford ; and when not hunting, his favourite ride was to the top of Foxcombe and along the brow of the hill towards Cumnor, as thence he could descry if not Fairford itself, yet much of the valley of the Upper Thames. Now, however, these relaxations were greatly curtailed : he spent the greater part of his day in those rooms in

the Old Library¹ which he often referred to in later life². 'I remember the rooms well,' he said at the close of his life, 'for I worked hard in them.'

He probably worked much too hard. Parker refers to his 'suicidal practice' at this date 'of reading sixteen or seventeen hours a day.' This was no doubt an exaggerated estimate; but Jelf writes at the time that 'Pusey reads most desperately, and it is as much as I can do to make him take an hour's exercise.' Pusey himself describes his later undergraduate life at Christ Church as having been that of 'a reading automaton who might by patience be made a human being.'

Of Pusey's reading at this date few traces remain. His notebook on Herodotus exists. Every chapter in the first six books is annotated: some at great length; and, as was usual even with serious scholars at that day—young as well as old—the notes are almost all in Latin. Here and there an idiomatic English translation is given—apparently taken down from a tutor in lecture. There are extant too some notes on Aeschylus, the Satires of Horace, and other classics. In these performances, written in a round, almost boyish hand, Pusey already shows the qualities of his maturer work, and especially the passion for exhaustive knowledge and statement, combined with complete indifference to method and style.

Of his notes on Pindar, whom he read perhaps more carefully than any ancient writer, nothing, so far as is known, remains. He read disinterestedly, so far as the Schools were concerned; not only books which he did not mean to offer to the examiners, but books which would do him no good in the examination. 'You have read, I believe,' wrote Parker, who knew him intimately, 'the

¹ The Old Library at Christ Church is the refectory of the Monastery, which, after serving as a library to the foundation of Wolsey and Henry VIII, was cut up into rooms for students, on the erection of the present splendid building on the north side of the Deanery garden.

² Pusey's first rooms in Christ Church were at the top of staircase

No. 8 in Peckwater, on the left. Thus his sitting room looked into Peckwater, or rather against the parapet which intercepts the view: his bedroom into Canterbury. Thence he moved into the Old Library, where he had the centre rooms on the middle floor, which have since been divided between two occupants, but then were a large and convenient set of rooms.

Phoenissae of Euripides: indeed, it is needless to ask you whether you have read it, for I always find that you are acquainted with any work that I casually mention.'

His strength lay in accurate verbal scholarship rather than in philosophy. Indeed, in those days—with the great exception of Bishop Butler—the philosophy which succeeded in the Schools was a good knowledge of the text and sense of Aristotle and of some few modern illustrations of him. Pusey largely learnt his philosophy in maturer years; he reversed the old order of studies, and entered it from the court of Theology.

In Easter Term, 1822, he was in the Schools. He was examined *vivâ voce* by the Rev. John Keble, who had taken a double first class just twelve years before. 'I never knew,' Keble once said, 'how Pindar might be put into English until I heard Pusey construe him in his examination¹.' Of his examination another anecdote was told to Professor Farrar, of Durham, by the Rev. G. Porter, Fellow of Queen's College, who was the senior examiner:—

'On the *vivâ voce* day,' writes Professor Farrar, 'to keep Pusey employed Porter set him to write an oration on some subject which I forget to illustrate the use of the *τόποι* in Aristotle's Rhetoric, bk. ii. 23. Pusey wrote an oratorical essay; I forget whether in English or Latin. Porter said that in the essay he had embodied and used every one of the twenty-nine *τόποι*. Porter predicted his greatness at that time—as I was afterwards told—and always regarded him as the man of the greatest ability that he had ever examined or known. He placed him far above Newman. Herein, of course, he was wrong; the two minds really being incommensurable.'

Edward Pusey's name appears in the first class with those of Edward Denison, afterwards Bishop of Salisbury, and of Richard Greswell, whom Oxford still remembers as one of the most learned and kindly of her older residents. In the same list is William Gresley, the well-known Prebendary of Lichfield, whose life in after years, not less than his writings, did so much to popularize the principles which the world has especially connected with the name of Pusey.

¹ Mr. Keble used these words to the present writer. The passage was, he believes, in the seventh Nemean ode.

CHAPTER II.

SWISS TOUR—BYRONISM—FIRST CONTACT WITH
UNBELIEF—MARRIAGE OF PHILIP PUSEY.

1822.

‘They do but grope in learning’s pedant round
Who on the phantasies of sense bestow
An idol substance, bidding us bow low
Before those shades of being which are found
Stirring or still on earth’s brief trial ground.’

Lyra Apostolica, xlii.

TO crown hard work by success in the Schools was, in those days as in these, to earn a holiday; and no opposition was now made at home to Edward Pusey’s proposal to go abroad for three months. His companion was Mr. Sheffield Neave, an Eton and Christ Church friend, who had graduated in the preceding year. They left England on July 4th, and after a halt in Paris, they reached the frontiers of Switzerland on the 14th, after an unusually fatiguing journey by diligence.

When as yet there were no railways, or Murray’s or Baedeker’s handbooks, a tour, if a more formidable, was perhaps also a more instructive undertaking than it is now. Observation was quickened by the reflection that the opportunity of visiting the scenes through which the traveller was moving was not likely to recur; and the greater difficulty of reaching them enhanced the sense of their value. Pusey kept a journal, which he wrote out at night from rough pencil notes jotted down in the course of each day. It describes much which, to us, with modern facilities for travel, may not appear to require description, and it is not lacking in the crude judgments and the misshapen and fantastic thoughts of a young man of

twenty-two. But it also discovers a breadth of interest, a delicacy of observation, and an intensity of feeling which are at least remarkable; and, in particular, it exhibits that same enthusiasm for the beauty of the natural world which is observable in his 'Commentary on the Minor Prophets,' and which he used to express in his last days of declining strength, so strongly and so often, in the pine-woods at Ascot. Nothing would appear to escape him: whether it be the formation and physiognomy of glaciers, or the forms and stratification of rocks, or the position of trees, or the effects of light, or the courses of torrents, or the varying aspects of mountain-peaks. But he is still more interested in all that bears on human character and human history; and especially in such self-sacrificing efforts for a great cause as were suggested by the districts through which he journeyed, and notably in Suwarrow's campaign against the French, or Tell's struggle for the freedom of his country. Now and then too, the journal, which was meant only for his own eye, affords glimpses of the feelings that then lay nearest to his heart; of his tender love for his mother, of his distress at the apparent hopelessness of his engagement; and, not least, of his religious temper, which, if as yet undisciplined, was already the ruling feature in his life and character.

But the peculiarity of the journal is that Pusey is almost as interested in the effects which the scenes he visited produced upon his own thoughts and feelings, as in the scenes themselves. This subjective and introspective tendency of his mind was partly an original element of his intellectual character. But it was developed and exaggerated by his disappointment in regard to his affections; and it had considerable influence on the subsequent development of his mental attitude towards theology.

After commenting on their weary ride across France, Pusey describes his first view of Mont Blanc, then far less familiar to Englishmen than now:—

'Whatever disappointments we had experienced were immeasurably overbalanced by this evening's enjoyment. I set off some hours

before sunset to a spot pointed out by Ebel, near the Grand Sacconnex on the right, as the best external view of Mont Blanc near Geneva. It at first appeared almost totally invested in light clouds, itself appearing scarcely a denser substance. The foreground harmonized admirably. Nearest, the blue lake partially seen through the trees, circled on the opposite side by the numberless villas each embosomed in wood. Thence rose a bold mountain as the central figure, towards which inclined others on each side, rising as they receded towards the lake. Behind stood Mont Blanc, whose chain formed a curve in the rear resting on the two mountains which flanked the centre. The whole summit of the mountain is clearly displayed, in every part abrupt, in every part beautiful. It had hardly that imposing effect which it had standing on a lower level, where I could almost imagine it impending over me, though at a distance of fifty miles. It, however, blended in a scene of the most perfect beauty. The mind, gradually raised by the nearer objects, was not unequal to its survey, though the wonderful intricacies of its form baffled examination. After an hour or more the sun rested on Mont Jura, and the scene gradually changed; the contrast was striking, as the shadow gradually invaded the villas on the plain; but when it had devoured the nearer mountains, when those which had just rivalled the monarch sunk as in death, and the mountain itself, with those of its suite, was kindled by the sun's full glory, and seemed to belong to another world, the soul was excited almost to tears.'

Geneva, Pusey writes when leaving it, 'excites no regret, in itself or its inhabitants.' But its environs 'possess endless variety.' The road to Chamonix is described in detail: almost every rock and waterfall is a separate study; and minute comparisons are instituted between successive scenes and the writer's recollections of Wales. Pusey describes the Mer de Glace as resembling

'a sea which had raised its waters with unwonted tumult, but whose fury had been suddenly stayed by Him, Whose it is to still the noise of His waves.'

While at the Jardin, he was vexed at being unable to analyze and record his own impressions:—

'The thoughts that rush across the mind at such times are too transient for observation even by yourself, though the tumult is calmed and the current directed by the sublimity of the scene which rouses them; any attempt to note them as they pass by would check them in their course. The wish to retain them is for the time lost in actual enjoyment; the care for their duration comes not till they are already past.'

The travellers were making the circuit of Mont Blanc, and at Contamines, where there was no inn, they had to put up with the parish priest.

‘At Contamines I was somewhat annoyed at finding that the only auberge was the Curé’s house ; he however leaving us after the first civilities, and not appearing again, seemed as unconstrained as he left us to be. I much mourned the low state of the Swiss Church, which appeared in this practice. The case is different in the Protestant cantons.’

The last sight of Mont Blanc is well described. The gradual retreat of the pink sunlight from point to point, ended at last, and the evening mist rose in the valley.

‘Though the vivid scene which had feasted our eyes so long left for some little time the illusion that the tints we had so much prized were yet there, yet it was but like the recoiling of the heart from unpleasing intelligence ; the truth was too soon marked in characters too intelligible that I had witnessed, perhaps for the last time, the most soul-filling scene in nature. The chill scene struck cold on my heart ; lovely as was the decay, and slow and gentle, there was too much to remind me of my own lot not to inspire the deepest melancholy.’

We all find in nature what we bring to it. Edward Pusey saw the shadows of his own heart reflected from the Swiss mountain.

‘The sun, which kindled Mont Blanc, will revisit and kindle it again with its glowing light, but when the warmth of feeling which has illumined and cheered the heart is once quenched, there may remain some smouldering embers to indicate that a flame once lighted it, but the snows of the mountain are not more cold or comfortless than that heart must be. Yet would I not exchange the heart, which could be ennobled by such feelings, even in its decay, for the dullness of insensibility. . . .

‘It may yet be blended, it is blended with religion and with the fire which came down from heaven. Yet then as ever it is necessary to subdue [my secret melancholy] and bear it alone. Neave, ignorant of its cause, must not share its effects, yet he occasionally excites it ; and when he bade me this evening take leave of the Aiguille Peak for ever, the words found a gloomy correspondence with feelings of my own. They are pressing on my soul more and more ; and Heaven alone can—He will if I bear me as a Christian—lighten my burthen.’

While retiring to Geneva, Pusey was much interested in the grotto near Balme. He describes a heavy thunder storm between Geneva and Lausanne. He sees ‘no beauty’

in Lausanne Cathedral—a judgment in which few visitors will agree with him ; and describes it as ‘wretchedly subdivided,’ as was no doubt the case at the date of his visit¹. The Castle of Chillon interested him as, at that time, a warm admirer of Byron.

They were prevented by a storm from visiting Rousseau’s home on the Island of St. Pierre. Berne is pronounced to be the most agreeable residence they had seen in Switzerland, on account of ‘its high situation, the river at its base, the stone porticoes, the broad streets, and the cheerful inhabitants.’

Waterfalls were of more account fifty years ago than they are in days when it is almost a distinction not to have seen Niagara.

‘The falls of Schaffhausen,’ says Pusey, ‘had been the sole object of a journey of two heavy days.

‘There is always a fear that the object of much panegyric is also the object of exaggeration. . . . We descended with our eyes fixed on the ground in order to raise them in a full view of the fall, and waited at the wooden door in a suspense which almost amounted to pain. When the door opened the fall, though not so high nor seen as in a picture, had a variety, a breadth, and a rapidity for which we were not in the least prepared.’

The friends spent some four hours looking steadily at the mighty volume of roaring waters, and at last tore themselves away with great difficulty.

From Schaffhausen they made their way to Zürich ; then along the lake to Rapperschwyl, and so to Weesen. The fine scenery of the Lake of Wallenstadt, the gorge of Pfiffers, and the view of the ravine of the Linth from the Pantenbrücke, are described at length. To Pusey the scene seemed

‘like the wreck of some mighty mind, which, amid decay and convulsion, preserves the majesty of its earlier state. . . . It was like him in whom was—

“All changed that ever charmed before,
Save the heart that beat for Ellinore.”’

¹ Two or three Calvinistic places of worship which were then sheltered within the ancient walls are now one.

But, of course, Swiss Protestantism does not know what to do with a cathedral, and is never at home in it.

In the subjoined description Pusey is thinking less of the scene which he describes than of mental conditions which were constantly present to his thoughts :—

‘The depth immediately below us was indicated by the torrent, which wound round where the ravine took its last turn, as another [torrent], whitening, trembled to meet it. On each side trees yet flourishing were bending as to meet over its division, or waving their arms as if they bowed towards it, while others, leafless and decaying, as they hung by the one yet remaining root, which yet upheld them with firmness almost incredible, while it seemed so far beyond its power to aid against storm and tempest, formed an emblem appropriate to the remainder of the scene. Buffeted and sore stricken by the tempest before which it had sunken, reft of the support in which it had trusted, and by which amid dangers it would have stood glorying and unmoved, deserted by the gradual withdrawing of all other aid, it was yet restrained, though nodding to its fall, from final destruction by one single support. When that support should cease, it was destined to plunge headlong from the mountain’s height deep in the roaring tide below to endless night.’

They partly followed the line of Suwarrow’s retreat from Glarus into the Valley of the Rhine in October, 1799 :—

‘A French lieutenant-general, whose party we joined, had himself been in the principal body of the army, before a detachment of which this retreat was made. He had attained his rank by carrying the bridge at Zurich in the battle which prevented the Russians from penetrating into France in ’98. He was travelling for his son’s health, who had sunk, through excessive exertion, into a state of gloom, to dispel which the scenes of Switzerland alone, it was hoped, would be equal. I hope so too ; yet there was a vacuity and absorption which, combined with the languor with which he raised his eyes on the most interesting objects, forbade hope. Heaven be praised who has preserved mine unimpaired.’

The incidents of this campaign were then generally remembered : and Pusey records each detail that he could learn with eager interest. While making their way towards the Righi, the travellers passed the site of Goldau, which, with three other villages, had been buried in September, 1806, by the landslip of the Rossberg :—

‘We saw some chalets yet remaining at the very edge of the inundation, and by which some of the stones bounded as they passed over

a slight eminence at the foot of the Rossberg. A few yards more had overwhelmed them. . . . Could you for a moment forget the cause of the wild confusion around you, the bare and fearful nakedness of the mountain still remains to recall it, and, should the valley ever regain any portion of its former cheerfulness, would be to their children's children an ever-present record of His power, before Whom the mountains tremble.'

The travellers enjoyed a fine sunrise on the Righi—which Pusey again visited in 1872. The preparatory warnings of the sun's appearance, the outburst of the dawn, the gradual flitting of the light from point to point, are dwelt on in succession :—

'It was singular how soon the objects from their structure or from their shadow most engrossing sunk into insignificance before the rising majesty of others, or how, when the loftiest had veiled themselves in clouds, the village spire received the full rays [of the sun]. It seemed the triumph of revealed over natural religion, when the objects most suited to the exercise of each had been placed in the balance and the latter even thus found wanting.'

A visit to Küssnacht followed, which provoked in Pusey an outburst of feeling, quickened perhaps by his general political sympathies :—

'All the spots which [Tell's] glorious name have rendered memorable have been made consecrated ground ; a chapel marks the spot where he was born, where he sprung from the boat which devoted him and his country to slavery, where he accomplished his country's freedom by the sacrifice of the inhuman tyrant.'

Before leaving the neighbourhood of Altdorf, Pusey visited Tell's chapel at Bürglen :—

'We soon gained admission. In leaning over the Altar, by means of which his countrymen have blended the feelings of patriotism and religion, I could not but address a prayer to our common Father for my own country, that it might long enjoy freedom unpolluted, that it might cultivate the virtues which alone merit that choicest gift a nation can receive, and without which it cannot be retained.'

Lucerne he thinks 'as poor as Swiss towns generally are.' The Lion which had been cut in the rock, after Thorwaldsen's model, in the preceding year (1821) to commemorate the Swiss Guard of Louis XVI., suggests to him that the soldiers of a free people are degraded by dying for a foreign potentate in a foreign land.

The St. Gothard Pass disappointed them. In the ascent of the Furca they met three parties of peasants on their way to spend the Feast of the Assumption at Einsiedeln:—

‘There was nothing in them apparently of the austerity of the pilgrim. In one fine female countenance alone I saw something of that superior dignity which the consciousness of being engaged in the performance of a religious duty and absorptive meditation on the sublimest objects can bestow. Some of them came from the Genevan cantons, others from the Valais, even as far as Sion its capital, where the priests exercise the most complete dominion. Neave wished we had been there; I neither regretted my absence now, nor that the visit to Einsiedeln itself had been laid aside from our adopting the route to Mont Praghel.

‘Had the spot to which they were repairing been really consecrated by the hallowed tread of our Saviour, had it witnessed Him going about doing good, had it heard the words of purity which He spake, or the prayer of faith from the unbeliever, converted because He spake as never man spake, one could have tolerated that some eager but misled disciple should have mingled other more particular impressions with the general feelings that pervade the Holy Land.

‘But there, where the very holiness imputed to the place is founded on an abject and mercenary superstition . . . every part is so revolting and at the same time so forcibly impressed by every object around the visitor, by the very crowd of worshippers with whose prayers he is to mingle, that every attempt to associate himself must be in vain. He must, in silence and alone, pray that their hearts may be enlightened at the same time that he petitions for himself that he may not think more highly than he ought to think.’

The appearance of the Jungfrau from one side as though its summit were ‘presiding over an unbroken cliff,’ although this cliff was really ‘formed of an intricate assemblage of parts,’ suggests to him how

‘when the petty circumstances of life are forgotten, and a man is no longer judged by the influence of portions of his life, he is seen but in the effect which the whole sway of the power he directed had on the happiness of mankind.’

The beauties of their mountain home were not lost, Pusey thought, upon the Swiss peasantry. After witnessing a village fête he writes:—

‘I was delighted thus to see that hundreds of this people felt the influence of the scenery by which they had been surrounded. I never saw a *jour de fête* in which there seemed to be so much intellect mixed

with physical delight. . . . In our descent we were much disappointed to find that the national dance (from which we had anticipated much pleasure, after having witnessed the graceful movements of the *pay-sannes* of Chillon) was prohibited, and ill-supplied by the activity and strength displayed in a wrestling match. The reason given (the fear of quarrels) was very unsatisfactory.'

The journal breaks off abruptly. Mr. Neave went on into Italy: Pusey was well on his way to England in the latter half of September.

Pusey's Swiss journal contains traces of a temper of mind which characterized him in varying degrees throughout his life as an undergraduate at Christ Church, and which he did not altogether throw off until some years had passed. Looking back upon it, he used to call it *Byronism*. The fascination which Byron exercised over young people in that generation was of course partly due to the genius of a writer who had made English poetry do some kinds of work in the realms of feeling that it had never done before. Pusey had too much of the scholar and poet in him to be insensible to the wealth of Byron's language and the exquisite music of his verse. But the secret of Byron's power—at least with refined natures—lay in his being the exponent of what was then a new and, to some minds, an attractive philosophy of life. In this philosophy the element of sensualism, coarse or subtle, would always have been repellent to a character like Pusey's: but Byron was also, in a sense, the prophet of the disappointed, and, as such, he threw a strange spell over Pusey as a young man, who had set his heart passionately upon an object which it seemed likely that he would not attain. That which Pusey afterwards condemned in himself as '*Byronism*' was a sad, nerveless, dreamy way of regarding life and nature, which imperceptibly tended towards a listless survey of evil as something which might almost be declared more interesting than deadly. Byron, as he looked out on the world, anticipated, although only vaguely, the blank despair of Leopardi and the systematized pessimism of Schopenhauer and Hartmann; and if Pusey never surrendered himself wholly to the magician, he often would reproach himself

in after years on the score of a phase of mind and feeling in which Byron had had any attractions for him at all.

‘The extreme force and beauty of Byron’s poetry,’ he says, ‘combined with a habit of deep and, in some degree, morbid feeling, which had always, more or less, a shade of gloom, induced us to give our assent to, and even in some measure exult in feelings of whose full extent we were either at the time not aware, or at least against which we half, and but half, shut our eyes.’

Again :—

‘The Byronist, though encircled by the purest air, with the golden sun, full of joy and pleasure, gleaming in the bright blue sky, will fix his eye on any speck of mist which he sees crouching near the horizon, and gaze on it till it swell and seem to fill heaven and earth. To a real Byronist a pure blue sky is a dull insipid thing. . . . It is the misery of Byronism that it fixes the mind exclusively upon the disease, and so distracts its sufferers from all thoughts of contributing to cure it ; or if the mind does rouse itself from the lethargies of its contemplations, the evil has, from being exclusively regarded, assumed such magnitude as to make all attempts seem hopeless. In the disordered state of the moral, as well as of the bodily eye, an object from being long gazed at fills the whole sense, assumes an unnatural and frightful size, and prevents the admission of any other. Byronism is a mere theoretical, not a practical habit. Like the god of Epicurus, it becomes in imagination the being of another world, and looks down upon the miseries and struggles of this, and leaves the unhappy wretches to their fate while it philosophizes upon them ; or, at best, it comments with almost a contemptuous pity on the ills it sees. I am, of course, only speaking of ripened and fully-developed Byronism, but I believe every shade of it makes the mind unpractical, and indisposed to apply the relief of Christianity to the ills it dwells upon. Christianity acknowledges as true most of the data of Byronism, that there are everywhere and in all our actions seeds of or admixtures of evil. It also draws them to the light, but with the difference, that it does so in ourselves, not in others, to mend not to exhibit their depravity.’

In October, 1827, he observes incidentally :—

‘My friend Luxmoore reminded me yesterday, in discussing Lord Byron with me, of an expression which I had used when nineteen, that I never arose from reading Lord Byron a better man.’

Thus to Pusey Byronism was for a while, and to some extent, his system or view of life. Looking back upon his early manhood he writes reproachfully of ‘my excessive Byronism.’ It did not indeed lead him to give up habits

of regular prayer; or to renounce his faith in God's loving providence; still less into moral mischiefs beyond. Young men will often contrive to hold incompatible principles, by storing them away in different compartments of the mind: but a time comes when a choice has to be made. Before that time came to Pusey, his 'Byronism' had been frankly abandoned. While it lasted it did him harm by leading him to dwell morbidly on thoughts and feelings which would have better been repressed and forgotten, but which in fact coloured his entire apprehension of nature and life. As Byron to a certain extent spoiled Pusey's view of the Swiss mountains; so, strange to say, Pusey at first read Walter Scott with Byron's eyes: Scott ministered to the feelings which Byron had roused and gratified. His brother Philip induced him to read 'Rokeby,' by telling him that he had a great deal of 'Wilfrid' in his character.

'I read the book,' he said long afterwards, 'most carefully, and found it so; it became from that time my greatest favourite. Maria, of course, occupied the place of Matilda. My destiny was, I know not how far, identified with Wilfrid's. You may, or rather cannot, conceive the effect of the beautiful "cypress wreath," or the few last words which Wilfrid addresses to Matilda. These were my principal treasures, though indeed any passage which I could torture into a means of distracting was welcome, and the book was complete poison.'

The love of study, the love of nature, the pensive melancholy mood, were to a certain extent common to Edward Pusey and Wilfrid.

'For a fond mother's care and joy
Were centred in her sickly boy.
No touch of childhood's frolic mood
Showed the elastic spring of blood:
Hour after hour he loved to pore
On Shakespeare's rich and varied lore.'

But that was only a superficial point of resemblance; and the reader need not be reminded of passages which will illustrate the deeper correspondence. He often used to say that we find what we look for in the books we read, even in the Bible. He was speaking in view of this early

experience. Pusey himself was not unaware of a natural tendency in himself to take a gloomy view of life: when older he was so constantly on his guard against it that few of his friends could have suspected the weakness. But as a young man his character was less perfectly disciplined; and his protracted disappointment about his engagement made improvement in this respect more difficult.

Chief among the causes which roused Pusey from the moral lassitude of 'Byronism' and left a lasting impress upon the direction of his thought and life was a controversy with an old schoolfellow which began soon after his Swiss tour. At Eton he had formed a friendship with Z., a boy slightly older than himself, and like himself of quiet steady habits, good abilities, and a retiring disposition. They were alike interested in subjects about which most boys do not think much, if at all; but Pusey's friend approached them in a self-reliant and scornful temper, which was too certain to earn its wonted penalties. The Eton system had, of course, no means of taking account of what was passing in the minds of the boys on the most serious subjects. The ordinary attendance at Chapel and lessons in Divinity did not prevent or control the upgrowth of thoughts and questionings which were full of significance for later years; and when young Z. went up to Cambridge, a college debating society went far to complete the work which had been begun at Eton. On leaving Cambridge he became intimate with Richard Carlile, the publisher of *The Republican*, and gave literary and pecuniary aid to the cause represented by that periodical. Much of his later life was spent in Paris: he died while yet comparatively young.

Pusey and his friend had learnt to understand each other pretty accurately while at school; and when they parted, their intercourse by letter became gradually less frequent and less intimate. It had ceased altogether for a year and a half, when in October, 1823, it was renewed by Pusey. He was throughout his life charitably sanguine, sometimes at the expense of his judgment; and he had apparently brought himself to hope that his friend's infidelity

had been a passing phase of mind, or at any rate much less pronounced and resolute than was really the case. As Z. had already lived much in France and was quite at home in the language, Pusey wrote to bespeak his aid in recommending to the Paris booksellers some translations of English religious works, with a view to their circulation among the French Protestants. Z. replied by an expression of his kindly feelings towards Pusey, accompanied by an unreserved statement of his present attitude towards religion. When they had parted a year and a half before, he had been, at the least, a sceptic. Now he was too much of a Pyrrhonist to think that any opinions, even when entirely negative, were certainly true ; but, if he were asked what system most nearly approached to truth, he should say Atheism. He would distribute anything that Pusey wished, but Pusey must not suppose that the books he recommended would have any sale in France. If Pusey would do something to the purpose, he had better set himself to refute the French philosophers who had opposed Christianity, such as Dupuis, Voltaire, Diderot, Holbach, Helvetius, Rousseau. If Pusey desired assistance in discovering their weak points he would be happy to give it. But this refutation of the French deists and atheists was the work that had to be done if any good, in Pusey's sense of good, was to be done in France.

Z.'s letters show that for a young man he was a wide reader. He read some of the Christian fathers ; some of the philosophical works of Cicero ; and more of Lucian and of Julian the Apostate, whose straightforward and vigorous style had a special attraction for him. He especially delighted in the Testament of the illiterate Curé, Jean Meslier¹, and wished to send Pusey a copy. But the writer who secured his warmest enthusiasm was Dupuis. At the outbreak of the Revolution, Dupuis had been a professor of Latin Eloquence in the College of France, and a member of the Academy of Inscriptions. He sat in the Convention which decided the fate of Louis XVI., and afterwards in

¹ Published by Voltaire in the '*Évangile de la Raison*.'

the Corps Legislatif. He died in 1809. His best claim to literary renown was by no means the cumbrous and fantastic work which delighted Z., and in which he attempted to give an account of the origin of all religions¹. It appeared when Robespierre's efforts to obtain some national recognition of a Supreme Being were being vanquished by the stern atheism of his Jacobin associates, and it was welcomed by the Paris of the Terror as the last word of science. But it had been well answered², and, in France at any rate, forgotten for some years, when it fell in Z.'s way. According to Dupuis, Christianity might be explained as a religious rendering of the astronomical observations of a rude age. Our Lord was the Sun; His Blessed Mother the constellation Virgo; the cross marked the intersection of the equator and the ecliptic, and so on³. Behind these absurdities there was a more serious materialism, but Z. was chiefly concerned with Dupuis' attacks on the claim of the Christian Faith to be God's last message to man.

He was generally too scornful and bitter to make the best of his case, or to recommend it to the sympathies of a young man like Edward Pusey. But he brought before and impressed upon Pusey's mind the living energy of unbelief as a fact in the modern world of most serious and threatening import. He endowed Pusey with a conviction which had much to do with shaping his life for sixty years, that the Faith of Christ had, in the very heart of Christendom, implacable enemies just as ready to crush it out of existence, if they could, as any who confronted the Apostles or the Church of the first three centuries.

It occurred to Pusey that he could help his friend by telling him how

'a man of first-rate abilities had persuaded himself of the truth of

¹ 'Origine de tous les cultes, ou Religion Universelle,' par Charles François Dupuis, citoyen Français. Paris, H. Agasse, l'an 3 de la République une et indivisible, 1794.

² 'La vérité et la sainteté du

Christianisme vengées des blasphèmes et des folles erreurs d'un livre intitulé, Origine de tous les cultes,' par le P. Lambert, 1796.

³ Dupuis, 'Origines,' iii. 92-245; *The Republican*, i. pp. 208-211.

Christianity, after having been, a little before he commenced the investigation, thoroughly persuaded that he never could believe it.'

The person thus referred to was another and far more intimate friend, whose doubts had been the subject of much earnest discussion and correspondence. But of all this, and of the process by which they were at last laid to rest, no trace remains. That such doubts should ever have been entertained by one whom he loved so dearly, was a deep distress to Edward Pusey, and he appears to have destroyed all the records of his relations with his friend during this period. Now, however, he thought that an account of this recovery of faith might be of assistance to Z.; and, at his request, his friend wrote a history of the inquiry by which he had satisfied himself of the truth of Christianity. It was sent to Z. by Pusey, together with a long letter of his own.

It failed of its intended effect. Good logic may remove difficulties which impede belief in sincere souls; but faith has its roots in a moral temper, and the absence of this temper reduces the most cogent arguments to silence. Nothing however could daunt Edward Pusey's perseverance. Z.'s comment on this letter was that it only represented a deist's attitude towards Christianity, and therefore could not help an atheist. Pusey then endeavoured to persuade his friend to read the well-known apologetic work¹ of Gottfried Less, which had been recently translated into English; but this proposal was civilly declined, on the ground of his 'being almost too lazy to read anything.' Edward Pusey then determined to accept Z.'s challenge, repeated more than once in the correspondence, to study Dupuis thoroughly with a view to answering him. The enterprise was, for a young Englishman of twenty-three, a sufficiently bold one. The reply to Dupuis was to be written in French; an English translation was an afterthought. This project was brought to a close by Edward Pusey's visit to Germany in 1825².

¹ 'Beweis der Wahrheit der Christlichen Religion,' Bremen, 1768.

² Pusey's MS. answer to Dupuis was in existence in 1831, when he sent

In December, 1823, Z. declined to correspond any further with Pusey, but Pusey still persevered in his efforts, and his earnestness, patience, self-depreciation, disinterestedness, could not but have their influence sooner or later. In the letters which follow his friend's tone has completely changed; he is genial, serious, almost sympathetic. The courtesies, however, of this later correspondence are invariably found side by side with a recognition of the gulf that divided the correspondents.

'I have now,' writes the friend, 'received three long and admirable letters, for which I am indefinitely obliged to you. I once naturally desired that you should, like myself, have been a convert to Dupuis; but I am now convinced that the cause of truth is much better served by your being his opponent. I only regret that the mass of learning contained in your letters should be thrown away on such an ignorant individual as myself. Many authors whom you quote I have scarcely even heard of, and I confess I am even by no means capable of always understanding the Greek quotations. I must beg and beseech you to compose a systematic refutation of my favourite author.'

But argument can only, in the event, have one of two results: it may compel agreement when men acknowledge the same premises; or, when this is not the case, it may show that agreement is out of the question. The courtesies of letter-writing avail little when there is in the background a fundamental difference as to the principles which ought to govern human lives. Edward Pusey was too sanguine and too generous to make this discovery as early as many another man in his position would have made it. But at last it gradually broke on him, although allusions to a correspondence with Z. are still found as late as 1827.

In a letter of that date, he is referring to another and more hopeful case of loss of faith:—

'Had I had such a prospect for my unhappy friend, my spirits had not been so broken by our fruitless correspondence. But when every fresh letter, at the same time that it abandoned some part of the intellectual system of error, or some portion of its proof, evinced a

for it 'in order to prepare an answer to some of the blasphemy of the Rotunda.' So far as the writer knows, it has long since been lost; but an

older notebook, apparently intended to furnish materials for the work, or some of them, still survives.

heart still more alienated from the idea of God, which it no longer believed, so that I no longer saw even the wreck of the friend of boyhood; when, seeing myself apparently the only remaining instrument to save him, there still seemed no hope that anything should be effected through me, my only respite from unhappiness was each short interval after sending a fresh letter with diminished hope, before I learnt that it also was useless. And [as for] the last letter—the pain of loosing from one's hold a drowning friend . . . would be happiness compared with it.'

In later years Pusey referred from time to time to this correspondence, without even naming the friend. On June 15, 1882, exactly three months before his death, he said that 'when twenty-two, he had been obliged to read an infidel book in order to help a friend who was in difficulties.'

'That,' he continued, 'was my first real experience of the deadly breath of infidel thought upon my soul. I never forget how utterly I shrank from it. It decided me to devote my life to the Old Testament; as I saw that that was the point of attack in our defences which would be most easily breached.'

But Z.'s was not the only friendship that was lost to Edward Pusey at this time by a lapse into infidelity:—

'I am grieved at heart,' writes R. W. Jelf, 'to hear of your other friend's alienation from religion. . . . You certainly are tried by witnessing such defections in those for whom you have regard. . . . Console yourself with the reflection that you have done much and may do more for those who have fallen away, and that those others for whom you are anxious are young, and may be imperceptibly influenced by you.'

Of a very different but yet important kind was the influence exercised on Pusey's mental history by the marriage of his eldest brother.

Philip Pusey had left Oxford in 1819 without taking his degree. This course did not necessarily imply, at that date, in young men of good position, any want of intelligence or industry. Oxford was an opportunity for forming friendships; it furnished intellectual and moral stimulus; and young men whose means enabled them to travel, and who had access to literary society, often preferred to finish their education in their own way. It was probably a mistake in all but a very few cases; but at least in Philip Pusey it did

not mean indolence or incapacity. In truth his was a strong and fertile mind, strenuously bent on self-improvement, and keenly alive to the momentous issues that depend on the deeper problems in religion and philosophy. Like his younger brother he shared in the quality of literary industry; he was passionately fond of the Greek and Latin classics, and kept up his acquaintance with them throughout life; and he was a systematic student of modern literature, English and foreign. In this respect he had the advantage of his younger brother, whose devotion, a few years later, to the Semitic languages and to theology was too absorbing to leave much time for general reading. But the brothers resembled each other in the warmth of their sympathies, in the practical character of their dispositions, in their indifference to appearance, and in their capacity for unreserved self-surrender to a great cause. Their paths in life were distinct; their convictions not always identical; but they were always on intimate and brotherly terms with each other; and, as Philip Pusey observed, his marriage was only less important to his brother Edward than it was to himself.

After leaving Oxford, Philip Pusey had travelled with his friend of Eton and Oxford days, and future brother-in-law, Lord Porchester. Their visit to Spain and Portugal, and their narrow escape from death at the hands of a guerilla chief, have been vividly described in a work which in the last generation was read by everybody¹; and Philip Pusey's own letters to his family at this time give evidence of those powers of observation and reflection which secured for him in after years such high consideration in the House of Commons. He returned to England at the end of June, 1822, when his brother Edward was about to leave for Switzerland. This Swiss tour, as has been noted, was at once followed by Philip's marriage.

Each brother had difficulties in marrying the lady on

¹ 'Portugal and Galicia, with a review of the social and political state of the Basque Provinces,' by the

Earl of Carnarvon: 3rd ed., London, John Murray, 1848; cf. ch. 7.

whom his affections were fixed ; but while in the case of the elder brother they disappeared at the end of four years, in that of the younger they were to last for a much longer period. At Highclere it seems probable that Lord Porchester's influence was exerted to promote the wishes of his friend and his sister ; while at Pusey the first impulse of an inexorable Toryism had yielded to the consideration that in such a matter as marriage character and disposition are of more importance than the colour of political opinions. The wedding took place in the old church of Highclere, adjoining the Castle, on October 4, 1822.

The introduction of Lady Emily Herbert to the family added greatly to Edward Pusey's happiness. She was brilliant, graceful, accomplished, a great reader of poetry, a musician of no mean order, an artist, at least, in knowledge and feeling. The central feature of her character was a remarkable combination of strength and tenderness : she was full of benevolent instincts, and she could turn them to good account by her practical and administrative ability. Thus she interested herself warmly in the agitation which preceded the first Reform Bill, and especially with the view of warning the country people against courses which might bring them into trouble. With this object she wrote some tracts¹ which had considerable circulation, and which could not have been composed by any one who had not studied closely the manners and feelings of the agricultural classes. No doubt she was on the side of order and property ; and her sympathy, good sense, and earnest moral and religious purpose are abundantly apparent.

These qualities gave her, throughout her life, a considerable influence for good over young men : she could rouse them to exertion, or recall them to a sense of duty, when other advisers were powerless ; and she knew how to enter into and encourage their efforts in the cause of truth and virtue. Combined with her other qualities was a naturally devotional temper ; and thus it was inevitable that she

¹ Such were, 'The Genuine Life of Mr. Francis Swing,' London, Joy, 1831 ; 'Greybourne, or The Rioter,' London, C. F. Cock, 1831.

would soon discover and strengthen the ties of a fast friendship with her brother-in-law, Edward Pusey.

How soon she learnt to do so is apparent from a novel which she wrote in the early years of her married life¹. It observes the law of three volumes; it contains a wedding and a murder. But it anticipates a characteristic of very modern novels; the authoress does not so much invent as describe; and she describes from her own observation. As a student of character she belongs to the school of Miss Austen; but when painting the manners of the country gentlemen of England sixty years ago she could command greater opportunities than fell to Miss Austen's lot. In early life she had travelled in Italy: her pictures of Italian scenery and character are pleasing and generally accurate; but the main interest of her book is that it is largely a record of the character and opinions of those among whom she moved. In particular Edward Pusey, as a young man, stands before us in its pages. Edgar Belmore, with his studious habits, his resolute and successful efforts to recover a friend from unbelief, his energetic unselfishness, the long and bitter disappointment of his affections, cannot be mistaken: and in conversations on the observance of the Lord's Day, on care for the religion of servants, on the claims of Christianity, on the respect due to parents, his very phrases may almost be recognized. It is no accident that the most prominent work in the description of an infidel library is Dupuis, or that the deepest interest of the book underlying all else in it that is grave or gay is the religious interest.

For more than thirty years, to her husband's delight and satisfaction, Lady Emily corresponded constantly with her brother-in-law. She entered warmly into the anxieties which preceded and delayed his marriage: her letter of congratulation was, he said, the most welcome of any that he received. On this occasion he gave her a copy of the German poet Claudius—the poet of home and friendship as these things were understood in Germany in its age of

¹ 'Waldegrave,' a novel, in three volumes; London, Colburn, 1829.

sentimentalism, and also the poet who, while simple and childlike in expression, is judging the spirit of his time with a searching accuracy, and who has known how to clothe some of the deepest things in literature with the playful irony of his verse. Claudius fitly suggested a life-long friendship between whatever was bright and tender in family life, and all that was most serious in theology.

This friendship lasted undimmed to Lady Emily's last hours. She soothed the anguish of Pusey's early years of widowhood; and in return he admitted her to share his thoughts and hopes and fears in those years when his heart and mind were taxed to the uttermost by the demands of the great Movement in which his share was so great and so responsible; and he found in her a sympathy more intelligent and responsive than that of any other member of his family. In her last hours he was at her bedside, and in his ministrations and words she found her greatest comfort and support.

CHAPTER III.

ORIEL COLLEGE—FIRST INTRODUCTION TO NEWMAN—
ELECTION TO FELLOWSHIP—EARLY ESTIMATE OF
PUSEY—DR. LLOYD'S LECTURES—LATIN ESSAY PRIZE.

1823–1824.

‘Ed ascoltava i lor sermoni.
Che a poetar mi davano intelletto.’

Purg. xxii. 128.

NEARLY a year before taking his degree Pusey had thought of standing for a Fellowship at Oriel. An Oriel Fellowship was at that time the greatest distinction in Oxford that could be won by competition; and in 1823 the list of Fellows comprised the most distinguished names of the University. Since 1814 Dr. Copleston, afterwards Bishop of Llandaff, had been Provost. Davison, Hampden, Arnold, had only recently ceased to be Fellows. Whately, Keble, Tyler, Hawkins, Dornford, Awdry, Jelf, were on the list. Newman was in his year of probation. For an undergraduate who had not yet taken his degree to aspire to a place in such a society might have well seemed audacious. But the idea was first suggested to him by a strong wish to know Mr. Keble, whose character even then inspired a strange reverence and love far beyond the circle of his immediate acquaintance. Mr. Keble while residing at Oriel was in the habit of spending his Oxford vacations at Fairford, where his father, who was Vicar of the neighbouring parish of Coln St. Aldwin, resided in a house of his own. Fairford had other attractions for Pusey; but it was the scene of his first meeting with Keble. In these matters too young men are apt to be imitative;

and the success of R. W. Jelf at the Oriel election of 1821, and John Parker's intention to stand in the following year, furnished Pusey with a new motive.

'I know not,' he writes to Parker, 'whether you are aware that at some far future day I have the intention of standing the same trial [as Jelf and you]. Your success would add immeasurably to its value. There could be no happier society within a college than Oriel would then unite for me; but the greatness of the good fortune would make me always doubt its being realized. And I have now a habit of never dwelling on anything which the "coming day" is to provide. Were it to be so it would certainly be the best-omened application of "When shall we three meet again?" which that oft-quoted enquiry ever met with.'

While reading for his Fellowship, Edward Pusey had to struggle with very bad health. In October and November, 1822, and also in the following April, while the examination was going on, he was in the care of Dr. Kidd. This, however, was not for him a new experience; in after years he used to say that 'nothing but *severe* illness need put a stop to reading.'

It was in the late autumn of 1822 that he met John Henry Newman, who had been elected Fellow of Oriel in the preceding April.

'Newman first saw him on his dining, as a stranger, at Oriel high table, when a guest of his Eton friend Jelf, and as a future candidate, as it was reported, for a fellowship. Newman used to speak in after life of this first introduction to one with whom eventually he was so closely united, and to "the blessing of whose long friendship and example," as he said in the Dedication to him of his first volume of Sermons, he had owed so much. His light curly head of hair was damp with the cold water which his headaches made necessary for his comfort; he walked fast with a young manner of carrying himself, and stood rather bowed, looking up from under his eyebrows, his shoulders rounded, and his bachelor's gown not buttoned at the elbow, but hanging loose over his wrists. His countenance was very sweet, and he spoke little¹.'

The etiquette of the election prescribed that every Fellow should be addressed by each candidate in a Latin letter. These letters were not at Oriel, as in some other colleges, written in prescribed form: they were independent

¹ 'Letters and Correspondence of J. H. Newman,' i. 115, 116.

compositions, and in some cases they had an effect upon the election. In 1823 one of these letters was preserved by its owner, 'from some impression of Pusey's future greatness':—

'Egregio doctoque viro, Carolo Johanni Plumer, Collegii Oriensis Socio dignissimo.

'Ut primum per aetatem quanti mihi quisque esset faciendus, judicium facere potui, nihil ad existimationem honestius, nihil ad delectationem jucundius mihi posse obtingere apud animum meum statui quam in Collegium Oriense aliquando cooptari. Oblatâ ergo jam tandem occasione amplissimi hujus honoris petendi, facere non possum quin a te, Vir Clarissime, enixe orem, ut mei rationem habeas. Quod si mihi praeter spem benè processerit eventus, omnia studia, omnem operam ad gratias quas quidem semper habebō maximas, aliquâ ex parte referendas conferam.

'Tui favoris studiosissimus,

'EDVARDUS B. PUSEY.

'ex aede Xti.

1823.'

The examination for Fellowships at Oriel had a traditional character which was well understood in Oxford. It was less a test of knowledge than of general capacity: it would only appear defective if judged by the standard of examinations in which subjects of study are valued more for their own sake than as instruments of mental training and discipline. And it practically succeeded. Oriel was incontestably the home of the most vigorous ability in Oxford; and we may wait a long while before special studies enable so many men to think and write with such effect as did the Fellows of this distinguished college in the second and third decades of the present century¹.

In 1823 the examination appears to have begun on Easter Eve, March 29th. On that day the candidates had to translate a passage of an English author into Latin, and to write an English essay. A long-remembered incident occurred, which was described by Cardinal Newman to the present writer:—

¹ Of the Oriel Fellowship Examination in 1838, fifteen years after Edward Pusey went into it, a vivid account by

the late Dean of St. Paul's is subjoined to this chapter.

'During the examination Pusey had one of his bad headaches and broke down. He tore up his essay, saying that there was no good in going on with it. Jenkyns¹ picked up the bits, put them together, and showed the essay to the Fellows. It was a capital essay.'

On Easter Monday things were even worse. After an hour's unsuccessful effort he wrote a letter begging to retire from the examination, and left the hall.

'The Fellows, however,' writes the Rev. C. J. Plumer, 'thinking it a pity that one who had shown so great promise should be lost to the college, requested me, who had some previous acquaintance with Pusey, to go over to his lodgings and persuade him to revoke his decision. I did so, and the result was that Pusey persevered.'

On Tuesday and Wednesday, therefore, he rejoined the other candidates in the hall; on Thursday he wrote a Latin essay and answered questions on philosophy, as the others had on Monday. These last papers, for some reason, he had to write in the ante-chapel, the hall being otherwise engaged. The porter at the college gate was asked on that day who would be elected. 'What do you think, Sir,' was the reply, 'of that gentleman in the chapel?'

He was elected, but on the understanding that he should not be asked to become a tutor. Oriel was very well supplied in this respect, and Pusey's health was none of the best. His acknowledgment of Jelf's congratulations is characteristic:—

'I ever thought that you had a happier mode than myself of expressing your feelings, and the delightful letter received yesterday convinced me of this more strongly. It held up the mirror to my own mind, and I saw all that I had thought, felt, wished, more clearly developed. Forgive my having put it (I hope it was no breach of trust, but my heart was full and I could not help it) into my mother's hands, who read it with tears, and my father's, who pronounced me above measure blessed that I had such a friend. With these exceptions it will remain sacred with me, as long as I have my being.'

Not the least generous of the congratulations which poured in on him was a letter from Mr. Parker, who had himself failed at Oriel in the preceding year; and

¹ Rev. Henry Jenkyns, M.A., Fellow of Oriel College, and afterwards Canon of Durham.

the bells of the parish church of Pusey expressed the satisfaction of his father and family.

Edward Pusey now found himself a member of a common room, to belong to which was itself an education¹. Unfriendly critics described this by saying that the Oriel common room 'stank of logic'²: but logic, if liable to misuse, is not without its value. The distinctive characteristic of the Oriel mind was exactness in thought, as the basis of exactness of expression. This was exhibited, although in different ways, by Newman and Keble not less than by Hawkins and Whately. Everybody practised more or less the Socratic method of improving thought by constant cross-questioning; but Whately and Hawkins especially excelled in this. The result was to discourage fine words, when homely expressions would suffice; to expose inaccurate and partial knowledge; to resolve imposing theories into their constituent ingredients; to force men back upon the principles which really governed their convictions.

The directions in which minds were led to move under this process were indeed widely different; but the intellectual impress was, in the main, the same. Quite at the close of his life Mr. Keble would criticize inaccurate or ambitious expressions in conversation, in his own gentle manner, but with the same incisive clearness as did the late Provost of Oriel. The terse epigrams which are attributed to Whately were rivalled by sentences which sometimes fell from Pusey in summing up a criticism or bringing a conversation to its close. The prose of Cardinal Newman, unrivalled as it is in this century, owes some of its best elements to those early years of contact with Whately and Hawkins.

It must be owned that the society of Oriel did not endow Pusey with its characteristic excellence of clear writing. Its main effect upon his mind was to intensify his desire to accumulate all the facts that might bear upon a given issue; and he did this with such conscientious thorough-

¹ See the brilliant description in Mozley, '*Reminiscences*,' i. 18.

² Newman's '*Apolpgia*,' p. 286, first ed.

ness, and was so anxious when stating the result to leave nothing unrecognized, that his style never took the clear and direct form which was easy and natural to writers like Whately. Oriel was the home of incessant although informal criticism ; and it did not escape the dangers which are inevitable when criticism is a predominant feature in social life. Of these one is to make our individual capacities or accomplishments an absolute rule of excellence. Edward Pusey is thinking of his Oriel experiences when in 1827 he writes :—

‘ Men forget that what is useful or injurious to themselves may not be so to others, and censure others for not adopting the line which has been useful to themselves, and think that because they could not do with impunity what others are doing, neither therefore could these. One observes the same in things to be done as well as in things to be left undone. Each not only takes the line which is most congenial to him, and in which he is therefore most likely to succeed, and be useful, but often tacitly blames others who do not the same. As a confirmation of this I copy out of the memorandum book of a friend observations on this trait of character in individuals known intimately to us, but one initial of which only you will recognize. Though dry to you, from not knowing them, it exactly illustrates the case. “C. is skilful in business and accounts: you see that he flies to college accounts even as a relief in illness. He was accordingly a most active treasurer, and often reproaches those who do not so much as himself in this respect. T. is a practical man and a good scholar and tutor. Accordingly he is indefatigable in the active parts of his office, prides himself upon it, and blames those who do not devote themselves so much to their pupils, and indulge in speculation and study, for which he has himself little inclination. H. is fond of study and speculation, and writes with ease. Accordingly he is a frequent preacher, has some smattering in divinity, but has less intercourse with his pupils and with his parishioners because it is less agreeable to him. D. is not devoted to his pupils, but is bent on the discharge of parochial duties, though they are inconsistent with his college offices. The reason is the same. He is not a more pious man, probably, than T., but likes parochial duties better. P. is little fitted for active intercourse with others, is shy, and expresses himself with hesitation and obscurity. Accordingly he is bent on the study of divinity, and somewhat censures those who are less laborious in this branch of duty.” (N. B.—P. only meant to censure those who neglected these duties for general society, for which he has comparatively little taste; and probably, in so doing, undervalued the good which others might do in society.) “W. is impatient of laborious study, and exclaims against

those who read too much, do not exert thought, &c." The author of the above remarks is H.'

Edward Pusey's most intimate friends in residence were then Hawkins, Newman, and Jelf. Mr. Keble had ceased to reside in Oxford within two months of Edward Pusey's election at Oriel. He resigned his tutorship at the end of Hilary Term, 1823, and his mother's death in May led to his leaving Oxford¹. He still, however, came to Oxford from time to time, and the impression produced by him upon Pusey at the close of his Oriel life was indeed profound.

'I always loved J. K. for his connexion with Fairford. But all he has said and done and written makes me esteem him more. There is a moral elevation in his character which I know in no other. His reticence and growing self-mistrust alone makes it, to an unattentive eye, less perceptible.'

Pusey did not at once get rooms in his new College. It was usual for the younger Fellows of Oriel to live in lodgings; as the college was at once small and popular, and its rooms were wanted for the undergraduates. Accordingly Pusey did not live within the walls before 1826, on his return from his first visit to Germany. In 1823 he had lodgings in the High Street, in the same house with Newman, a circumstance which led to the first phase of their intimacy.

Cardinal Newman has described his relations with Edward Pusey during the five years and a half in which they were Fellows of Oriel together, in the pages of the '*Apologia*':—

'At that time (from 1823) I had the intimacy of my dear and true friend, Dr. Pusey; and could not fail to admire and revere a soul so devoted to the cause of religion, so full of good works, so faithful in his affections. But he left residence when I was getting to know him well².'

But a fuller record of their earliest friendship is given in the autobiographical portion of the first volume of Cardinal Newman's '*Letters and Correspondence*.' In the following

¹ Coleridge, '*Memoir of Keble*,' p. 103.

² '*Apologia pro Vitâ Sua*' (1st ed.), p. 74.

quotation Cardinal Newman is speaking of himself in the third person:—

‘It is interesting to trace the course of Newman’s remarks on Pusey in his private journal, commencing as they do in a high patronizing tone, and gradually changing into the expression of simple admiration of his new friend. April 4, 1823, he writes, speaking of the election of Fellows: “Two men have succeeded this morning” (E. B. Pusey and W. R. Churton) “who, I trust, are favourably disposed to religion, or at least moral and thinking, not worldly and careless, men”; and he goes on to pray that they may be brought “into the true Church.” On the 13th he notes down: “I have taken a short walk with Pusey after church, and we have had some very pleasing conversation. He is a searching man, and seems to delight in talking on religious subjects.” By May 2 Newman has advanced further in his good opinion of him. He writes: “I have had several conversations with Pusey on religion since I last mentioned him. How can I doubt his seriousness? His very eagerness to talk of the Scriptures seems to prove it. May I lead him forward, at the same time gaining good from him! He has told me the plan of his Essay for the Chancellor’s prize, and I clearly see that it is much better than mine. I cannot think I shall get it; to this day I have thought I should.” And on May 17 he remarks: “That Pusey is Thine, O Lord, how can I doubt? His deep views of the Pastoral Office, his high ideas of the spiritual rest of the Sabbath, his devotional spirit, his love of the Scriptures, his firmness and zeal, all testify to the operation of the Holy Ghost; yet I fear he is prejudiced against Thy children. Let me never be eager to convert him to a *party* or to a form of *opinion*. Lead us both on in the way of Thy commandments. What am I that I should be so blest in my near associates?”

‘Nothing more is said in these private notes about Pusey before the Long Vacation; but hardly is it over when he notes down: “Have just had a most delightful walk with Pusey: our subjects all religious, all devotional and practical. At last we fell to talking of Henry Martyn and missionaries. He spoke beautifully on the question, Who are to go?”

‘On February 1 of the next year (1824) he notes down: “Have just walked with Pusey; he seems growing in the best things—in humility and love of God and man. What an active devoted spirit! God grant he may not, like Martyn, ‘burn as phosphorus!’” Lastly, on March 15, when the year from his first acquaintance with Pusey had not yet run out, he writes: “Took a walk with Pusey: discoursed on missionary subjects. I must bear every circumstance in continual remembrance. We went along the lower London road, crossed to Cowley, and, coming back, just before we arrived at Magdalen Bridge turnpike, he expressed to me . . .”

‘There is a blank in the MS. The writer has not put into words

what this special confidence was which so affected him. He continues: "Oh, what words shall I use? My heart is full. How should I be humbled to the dust! What importance I think myself of! My deeds, my abilities, my writings! Whereas he is humility itself, and gentleness and love, and zeal, and self-devotion. Bless him with Thy fullest gifts, and grant me to imitate him¹."

In May, 1823, Edward Pusey attended for the first time the lectures of Dr. Lloyd, who had succeeded to the Regius Chair of Divinity in 1822. A man of clear, strong intellect, and of great tenacity and earnestness of purpose, he soon made his Chair more of a power in Oxford than it had been under any of his predecessors, not excepting Van Mildert. Dr. Lloyd's class comprised, besides Pusey, J. H. Newman, R. W. Jelf, and William Churton, from Oriel; John Williams, H. L. Thomas, and two others from Christ Church.

The books upon which Dr. Lloyd lectured were Sumner's 'Records of the Creation,' Graves on the Pentateuch, Casaubon's 'Exercitationes on the Prolegomena of Baronius,' Prideaux's 'Connexion,' Lowman's 'Civil Government of the Hebrews' and 'Hebrew Ritual,' and Warburton's 'Divine Legation.' Of these works, the first four engaged the attention of the Professor and his class for two years. Edward Pusey made in some cases elaborate notes and analyses of these lectures. Those on Graves' work are interesting as showing how fully, at this early period, the older objections to the Mosaic authorship and Divine authority of the Pentateuch were present to his mind, and how carefully he had begun to consider them. Referring to another course of Dr. Lloyd's lectures, on the Epistle to the Romans, 'Lloyd taught us,' Pusey often said, 'not so much the full meaning of the Holy Scripture, as how to study it.' He never explained more than three or four verses within the hour. But he first exhausted the history of every doubtful reading, every word, every construction, the place of each clause and argument in relation to its context; and then he would review the fortunes of the passage in Christian

¹ Newman's 'Letters and Correspondence,' i. 116-118.

theology; its bearings on Christian doctrine; the controversies which it had roused or had decided; the position it held, or ought to hold, in the mind of the living Church. Of these lectures there are copious notes in Pusey's handwriting to the end of the ninth chapter of the Epistle. These notes would, from the nature of the case, do at best a very partial justice to the original: they do not correspond to Dr. Pusey's often repeated estimate of the lectures. They are chiefly concerned with the direct elucidation of the text. In many cases the strong, clear sentences are evidently Dr. Lloyd's. The illustrations are frequently from authors which have fallen into disuse and are forgotten by the present generation; the scholarship is old-fashioned, although in its way thorough. It cannot be doubted that these lectures had a very real effect upon Dr. Pusey's mind and work as a student and expositor of Holy Scripture.

'When Bishop Lloyd began lecturing us on the Epistle to the Romans he occupied the first lecture with the first four verses, and of course that gave us a very different idea of reading the New Testament from any that we had had before¹.'

While Pusey was attending Dr. Lloyd's lectures he was consulted about a plan for reading divinity by his friend Mr. R. Salwey. In reply he sent Dr. Lloyd's list of books, observing that

'the list is rather addressed to the understanding than to the heart, and practical books must in great measure be supplied by yourself. Of these you will find several very valuable ones on the lists of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. "The Clergyman's Instructor" is an excellent collection of tracts on clerical duties.'

In a later letter to Mr. Salwey he recommends for

'a little practical reading, to mix with so much that is intellectual, Scott's "Christian Life."'

Salwey, he thought, would be alarmed at the number of books which he had marked as necessary to be read. By

¹ Oxford University Commission: Minutes of Evidence, p. 296. Nov. 3, 1877.

way of calming him, Edward Pusey adds characteristically :—

‘Even when we have got through all, or many more, I do not think we shall have to complain of knowing too much on the subject. During the whole, one book is never to be out of our hands—the Bible. And by comparing that with itself, we shall by God’s assistance understand more of it than by any single means; though of course even that is not sufficient by itself. You will find an interleaved Bible of great use, into which may be inserted any expositions of single texts which may be worth collecting out of books which are not express commentaries, and which would otherwise be lost. One of the best commentators is Theophylact (he abridged Chrysostom); he is one of the clearest and simplest. . . .’

On another subject which Dr. Lloyd’s lectures brought strongly before him, he writes :—

‘The different systems of evidence are independent [of each other], and therefore cumulative [in their force]. Paley proves the truth of Christianity one way, Lord Lyttelton another. Proving the authenticity of the books is often a very great point; but it is only part of what is to be done.’

One effect of Dr. Lloyd’s lectures on his judgment as to the relative importance of different theological studies is that ignorance of modern ecclesiastical history (nothing is said about ancient) can

‘hardly ever be so painful, and [the knowledge of it] is not so much a duty, as the knowledge of the evidences of the fundamental doctrines of Christianity.’

In the Long Vacation of 1823 Edward Pusey went into Devonshire, but the beginning of the October Term found him again at Oxford, and the winter and early spring of 1824 were largely occupied in writing for the Latin Essay. The subject might have seemed hardly congenial to Pusey’s mental bias; it was a comparison between the Greek and Roman colonies. But he threw himself into it heart and soul.

In its choice and vigour of language and in exact method of statement, as well as in the evidence it affords of extensive reading, this essay probably is above the level of many of those which have won a University prize at Oxford. The

Her deepest interest becomes apparent when he traces the character of that union between the Greek colony and the present state which was secured by a common religion. The future of England, as built up by her colonies, will, he anticipates, be more beneficial than the Greek, and more solid than the Roman. The glowing fervour of the closing words almost anticipates the higher visions of the *Prohemion*:—

Stant artes Graeciae, dissipatae sunt Romanae res, Christi verò sempiternis saeculorum aetatibus auctam usque adeo fore, certissimo testimonio abundè constat, donec, extincto quodcunque pravum est, inhumanum, uno caritatis vinculo ultimas terras comprehenderit.

Pusey did not expect to succeed; he always formed a poor estimate of his own performances. However, the examiners, one of whom was Milman, then Professor of Poetry, thought his work worthy of the prize. Mr. Pusey, now in his seventy-ninth year, heard his son read his essay in the Sheldonian Theatre on June 30, and the bells of Pusey parish church greeted the family party on their return home in the late summer evening.

In the closing weeks of 1824 he had begun to read the English Essay of the following year. Writing to Mr. Parker, he says:—

A large portion of the next five months is to be taken up by writing another essay. . . . The subject is a tremendous one: the language in its copiousness and structure considered as a test of education"; in English. It is a source of anxious thought how this which I am advised to pursue will qualify me for the great work of life. In five months it will all be over, and then I shall have no other calls.'

In the event this essay was won by Mr. J. W. Milne, of Marl. The subject, as his friend Parker jestingly imagined, was eminently adapted to Edward Pusey's natural bent; but already the pressure of graver duties and considerations was weighed heavily upon him, and in deference to his friends he had made up his mind to study theology in any.

APPENDIX TO CHAPTER III.

LETTER FROM THE LATE DR. CHURCH, DEAN OF ST. PAUL'S.

MY DEAR LIDDON,

Jan. 31st, 1883.

I will try and put down what I remember of the Oriel Fellowship examinations in the old time.

They never advertised vacancies in those days. The Provost held his head high, and said that if persons wanted to know if there were any Fellowships to be filled up they could come and inquire; and it was only late in my residence that some of the younger and more practical men carried the point about advertising. Besides, in the older time Oriel and Balliol Fellowships were things that every one was keen about, and every one knew without advertising how many were to be tried for. The first thing to be done was to call on the Provost, and ask his leave to stand. He would ask you what your plans were, and whether you knew any of the Fellows, and what your family was, and what your means were; for independent means were held to exclude a man. Indeed, this rule was once put in force, but by the college, not by the Provost, who was blamed for allowing the candidate to stand: the result being that it gave us Burgon instead of Goldwin Smith. It was intended as a protest in favour of the poorer candidate, but it was not altogether a satisfactory way of making it. Probably when Dr. Pusey stood, such questions as these were all that were asked. But in the years of the Movement the Provost was more inquisitive. Then there were questions asked relating to religious parties and opinions in the University, and one used to hear odd stories of fencings between the Provost and the intending candidates. But I do not recollect that he ever excluded a man because of his views: he allowed such a man as Albany Christie to stand.

If the Provost gave leave, he told you that you were to write a Latin letter to each of the Fellows, stating the grounds on which you desired election, and on which you thought that you might be entitled to do so. This was not a mere formal application, and in some cases it was a lengthy affair: it was meant to test a man's power of putting his own personal case and wishes and intentions in Latin; some of these letters were very good and characteristic. You were also to call and present yourself to the Dean, and some one or other of the Fellows, or

else the Dean asked you once or twice to dine and go to common room, where, of course, you were more or less trotted out and observed upon.

The examination was always in Easter week, and lasted four days, from Monday to Thursday. I received a card (I am speaking of 1838) from the Dean, W. J. Copleston, telling me to be in hall at ten on Monday, and bring with me a certain volume of the 'Spectator.' On Monday accordingly we all met in the hall. We were told that we might have as long as we liked for our papers till it got too dark to see, but we should not have candles: that the papers would be given us together, which we might work at as we pleased; but that we must remain in the hall till we had done them, or till we went out for good. There was to be no break in the middle of the day to go out. Copleston then told us what we were to do. We had a longish passage from our 'Spectators' to turn into Latin, and an English essay to write on a passage of Bacon. And then he left us to make what use of our time we liked. Most of us worked on till about five. I remember being bored at not knowing which paper to attack first. It used to be said that when James Mozley was in for the Fellowship he kept on till the last, and when it got dark lay down by the fire and wrote by the firelight, and produced an English essay of about ten lines. But the ten lines were such as no other man in [Oxford] could have written. On Tuesday it was the same thing, the papers being a Latin essay and (I think) a bit of English to be translated into Greek. On Wednesday, a bit of Greek to be translated into English, and a paper of so-called philosophical questions¹. On Thursday, I think only one paper, Latin into English. But the work was mainly composition and translation. The questions were very general, not involving directly much knowledge, but trying how a man could treat ordinary questions which interest cultivated men. It was altogether a trial, not of how much men knew, but of *how* they knew, and what they could do. The last two days were varied by excursions to the 'Tower' for *vivâ voce*, which was made a good deal of. One of the Fellows called you out from the hall, and led you up a winding corkscrew staircase, at the top of which a door opened, and let you into the presence of the assembled Fellows seated round a table, with pen and paper before them. You were placed before a desk, on which were Greek and Latin texts. You were given one of these, and told to look over a given passage for two minutes, or one minute, or to read it off at sight and translate it. This you did in perfect silence round you—the only thing heard, besides your own voice, being the scratching of a dozen pens at the table. You bungled through it without remark, and another book was given you, and then another—the last being perhaps some unintelligible passage from Plutarch about the moon, or the like. When you had done the Provost thanked you;

¹ I am not quite sure of the *order* on Wednesday and Thursday; but I am of the papers.

and another Junior Fellow took charge of you, conversing pleasantly with you in your stupefied condition, and escorted you to the common room, where you remained for the rest of the time. The next and last day *vivâ voce* again, in the same way, not quite so bad, because you were more accustomed to it, but still very horrible; and then you went home. If you were elected, the Provost's servant called on you the next day, with the Provost's compliments, and requested your presence at the scene of your late torture, the Tower; and you went and received the congratulations of the Provost and Fellows; and later you were admitted Probationer Fellow in chapel. You were introduced after service by one of the Junior Fellows, who led you to the Provost's stall; and the Provost, as if much surprised, asked you, 'Domine, quid petis?' to which you answered, 'Peto beneficium hujusce collegii in annum,' which the Provost graciously conceded to you, and you were conducted to your place.

That is from the side of the examinee. Afterwards I saw the same thing from behind the scenes. The idea of the examination was an old-fashioned one, rather pointedly contrasted with the newer modes then coming in of setting questions implying a good deal of modern or of somewhat pretentious reading, in history, philology, and modern books of philosophy and political science. The Oriel common room was rather proud of its seemingly easy and commonplace and unpretending tests of a man's skill in languages and habits and power of thinking for himself. They did not care if he had read much, so that he came up to their standard of good Latin, good Greek, good English, and good sense: points which were as well settled by a well-chosen bit of the 'Spectator' as by some fine paragraph from Macaulay, and by a well-chosen text for an English essay as by some question which made a man feel a fine fellow by having it to write upon. It created a prejudice against a man if he seemed to be trying to be flash, or to show off his reading, especially if he also showed that he did not know how to make good use of it. The two papers which were almost invariably the guide to the first decision were the English into Latin prose and the English essay. It was very seldom that men who were clearly first in these did not maintain their superiority throughout the rest of the examination, and no man who failed in these had much chance of retrieving himself. Next to these papers the Latin essay and the translations into English told. The Questions paper was more by way of make-weight in helping to decide a difficult choice. The papers were very carefully read and considered. The custom was for the whole body of Fellows to examine together each set of papers. We met in common room and sat round the table, each of us having one man's essay or translation; if a translation, one of us read a sentence of the English, &c., and the corresponding sentence of each translation went round the table in turn, till the paper had been gone through, sentence by sentence, and each sentence had been discussed and criticized. It was a tedious process, but very

thorough, and rather amusing in watching the way in which difficulties were met or pitfalls avoided by different men. The English and Latin essays were also read aloud, so that at the end we got a very distinct notion of the strength or weakness of each candidate. This way of doing things was, I think, given up in the later part of my residence. We inherited it from the days when Copleston was Provost, and the older men set much value on it. Among other things, it compelled each examiner to attend to the work in detail, and enabled his brethren to pull him up if he was slack or had crotchets. There was no scamping the work of examination, and it brought out each critic's capacity to judge, betraying disagreeably weaknesses about quantities and knowledge of the use of the subjunctive mood. The style of examination was objected to as narrow and minute, as it certainly was troublesome. But it was certainly searching both to examinee and examiner, and it was not easy for a crammer or loose scholar or mere fine writer to slip through the meshes. A good deal of weight was attached to *vivâ voce*, which, as I said, was spread over two days. It was thought to be a good test of the way in which a man met difficulties, and whether he faced them fairly or tried to evade them.

Ever yours,

R. W. CHURCH.

CHAPTER IV.

FIRST VISIT TO GERMANY — EICHHORN, THOLUCK,
SCHLEIERMACHER, NEANDER, AND OTHER PRO-
FESSORS—LITERARY PLANS.

1825-1826.

‘Macte novâ virtute, puer: sic itur ad astra.’

Aen. ix. 641.

ON June 5, 1825, Edward Pusey left London for Göttingen.

He had two main objects in going to Germany. His correspondence with his unbelieving ‘friend,’ and the inquiries into which it had led him, satisfied him that he had to deal with larger questions than he had supposed. These questions, he thought, could be studied most thoroughly at Universities in which faith and a scarcely disguised unbelief had been in conflict for more than a generation.

Less’s apologetic work had been only partly translated into English; and Pusey had found the translated part useful in his correspondence on the question of faith and he wished to be able to read the remainder. This experience further suggested to him that there was much else worth reading in German literature; and thus he gradually formed a purpose of making himself acquainted with the language and theological learning of Germany in Germany itself. He began with a German tutor in his Oxford lodgings; and he describes his first efforts, three years afterwards, as follows:—

‘I commenced with poetry in preference, because I found that I invariably forgot the first words in a complex German prose sentence before I got to the last, which is often the key to the whole. . . . With all my assiduity I do not believe that I read more than one

Gospel, six plays (an odd proportion), and a little prose, in the first month. But as I have often said, the vessel glides merrily along when the first labour of launching is over.'

Early in the Summer Term of 1825 Jelf pressed him to visit their common friend Luxmoore at St. Asaph: and this obliged him to decide upon the project which had been taking shape in his mind, of spending the Long Vacation in Germany. Jelf thereupon abandoned his plan of visiting North Wales, and pressed Parker to visit Oxford in a letter to which Pusey added the following words:—

'I requested Jelf to bring me this letter that I might add a few lines. But he has been expressing his admiration of German verbs to me with such prolixity that he has left me no time. I much regret the loss of my visit to Luxmoore, but having already found the want of German [very inconvenient], and expecting to be still more at fault hereafter, and being so advised, I determined to seize the present moment. I half expect to be able to seduce Jelf to join me. Pray let me see you here. Jelf and Newman are talking so incessantly that I can write no more.'

Parker in reply seems to have rallied him on the mystery and vagueness in which his plans were veiled. Pusey accordingly, within a fortnight of leaving England, expresses himself more explicitly:—

'Oxford, May 25, 1825.

'Though generally I plead guilty to the charge of unintelligibility, in the present instance it was owing neither to wilfulness nor carelessness, but to my entire ignorance on all the points on which you accuse me of obscurity. To what part of Germany I am going, whether to Dresden, Leipzig, Halle, Göttingen, or all of them, I am yet undecided; and it will depend probably on the introductions which I get, and the time I can spare, and the advance I may make in the language. When I go is yet uncertain, though since I last wrote I have pretty well determined to go as soon as our private lectures with Lloyd are over. My object in going is neither a particular book, nor a particular part of theology; so that I can only state generally that I hope to derive great assistance from the German literature in all the critical and scientific parts of Divinity; and particularly, if I am ever enabled to write anything on the Evidences, there are some of their works, such as the untranslated part of Less, &c., which I should wish first to study. I hope this is clear.'

But the strongest motive which led to this his first visit

to Germany was Dr. Lloyd's advice. Pusey told the present writer long afterwards :—

'People were saying that the new German theology was full of interest. At that time only two persons¹ in Oxford were said to know German, although German Introductions to the New Testament, if written in Latin, were read. One day Dr. Lloyd said to me, "I wish you would learn something about those German critics." In the obedient spirit of those times I set myself at once to learn German, and I went to Göttingen to study at once the language and the theology. My life turned on that hint of Lloyd's.'

When he reached Göttingen, his first step was to place himself under a teacher of the German language, by whom he was advised to attend the lectures of Pott and Eichhorn. 'They both,' said his friend, 'speak very good German.' In August he wrote to Newman :—

'I have now been here six weeks; read not so much as I wish; attend three lectures a day, for the sake of the German; see what society I can, and hope to be able at the end of the time to understand German pretty well².'

Eichhorn was now seventy-three years old. In this very year, 1825, he kept the jubilee of his Doctor's degree. He was one of those giants of learning whose great reputation as scholars did something to console their country at the beginning of this century for its political insignificance. He was 'one of the glories of the University of Göttingen.' For fifty years he had worked indefatigably, and in full possession of his health and faculties. During twelve years he had been Professor of the Oriental Languages at Jena; and in 1787 he had been invited by the Hanoverian Government to Göttingen, where he continued to be Professor of Philosophy until his death. Even for a German professor his productive power was exceptionally great³. On the one

¹ These were Dr. Cardwell, Principal of St. Alban Hall, and Mr. Mill, of Magdalen College.

² The Rev. R. F. Wilson, who, like Pusey, spent some time as a student in Germany, writes:—"I remember a little incident in my German life which will amuse you. I think it was Professor Brandis who once said,

"You talk freely in German, and we understand you; but it is incorrect and ungrammatical. Dr. Pusey would not speak German until he had mastered the language so as to speak correctly."

³ Tychsel, 'Memoria J. G. Eichhorn' (Comm. Soc. Scient. Götting., vol. vi).

hand he ranged through the Oriental languages, and the criticism and exegesis of the Old and New Testaments. On the other, his Chair at Göttingen obliged him to devote himself to the vast fields of modern history and literature. As a young man he wrote a book on the commerce of India in days preceding the Mohammedan conquest. Another work followed on the sources of Arabian history, and particularly on the Arab coinage. Then he produced eighteen volumes of a 'Repertory of Biblical and Oriental Literature,' and ten volumes of a 'Universal Library of Biblical Literature,' besides a work on 'Primitive History.' Simultaneously with these he had composed an 'Introduction to the Old Testament,' in five volumes; and an 'Introduction to the Apocryphal Books of the Old Testament.'

Nor were the subjects more directly connected with his Chair at Göttingen forgotten. Besides contributing to 'The History of the Arts and Sciences from the Restoration of Letters to the end of the Eighteenth Century,' he produced a 'History of Literature from its Origin until Modern Times,' in twelve volumes, a 'History of the last Three Centuries,' portions of a 'Universal History,' and a collection of his 'Writings and Criticisms.' He was at the same time occupied with the work which is best known in this country, his 'Introduction to the New Testament,' the second edition of which, in five volumes, had just appeared when Pusey arrived at Göttingen. He was now at the height of his authority, and his academical contemporaries looked on him as a typical sample of University success¹. But already his health was declining; he died after a short illness on June 27, 1827.

In 1825 Eichhorn was lecturing on the Epistles of St. Paul and the Books of Moses. Pusey attended the latter course. He was struck by Eichhorn's 'total insensibility to the real religious import of the narrative,' although the critical and historical information was often astonishing. 'We shall

¹ Eichstaedt, 'Oratio de J. G. Eichhorn, illustri exemplo felicitatis Academicæ.' Jenæ, 1827.

see,' said a German student, who was also attending the lecture, to Pusey, 'what fun he will make of Balaam's ass when he comes to it¹.' Yet Eichhorn certainly meant to be on his guard against the shallow and frivolous scornfulness of vulgar unbelief: nay, he was defending in these very lectures against Gesenius, De Wette, and Wegscheider the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch; he playfully described himself as 'too orthodox' when doing this. Only in him religious interests were entirely subordinate to the supposed interests of literature; the supernatural element was treated not as an objective reality but as representing an ancient and profoundly interesting phase of mind: the religious question 'what after all is true?' would have seemed an impertinent interference with the purely literary and critical question, 'what was thought or felt²?'

From Eichhorn Pusey learnt the vastness of the world of modern learning and the standard of work which was necessary in order to explore it. When in later years he would say, 'a German professor would think nothing of doing so and so,' he meant Eichhorn. In 1825 Eichhorn was still 'an oracle³,' but he lived long enough to witness a decline of his authority in Germany⁴. Pusey himself, however, early formed an independent judgment of his merits. He saw that Eichhorn had suffered by being a pupil of Michaelis, whose conception of the relative value of religion and scholarship is illustrated by his having asked his dying father which of Castelli's Lexicons he thought the best⁵. Eichhorn assumed that

¹ 'Univ. Commission: Minutes of Evidence,' p. 297: 'Eichhorn had then a great reputation for acuteness, but was profane. I asked a theological student whether he was going down, the term being nearly over. He said no; he should wait until the history of Balaam came on, because it was such fun. This I heard with my own ears; and I heard the lecture. I heard a titter going through all the room, and I saw only one person who was grave. I happened to sit where

I could see the whole of them.' This evidence was given Nov. 3, 1877.

² Eichhorn's 'Einleitung in das A. T.' is an attempted application to Hebrew antiquity of the principles by which Heyne and his school had explained the Greek mythology.

³ 'Daniel the Prophet,' p. 202.

⁴ See Bertheau's art. s. v. in Herzog's 'Real-Encycl.' His characteristic positions were attacked by Jahn, Kelle, Meyer, and others.

⁵ Preface to Mich. 'Syr. Chresto-

every phenomenon in Revealed Religion had a human origin¹. His mind was 'original and elegant, but ill-regulated.' He cared more for novelty than for truth; his theories were numerous; but they were demolished, one after another, before his eyes². In later life Pusey refers with approbation to him on points where his better judgment was not embarrassed by the seductions of theory³, but generally notices him only to reject opinions inconsistent with serious belief in the supernatural character of Revelation⁴.

Eichhorn's influence was only to a certain extent perpetuated in Ewald, the 'eager defender of a master whom he admired⁵,' with whom, as a fellow-student and contemporary critic, Pusey had life-long relations. But Eichhorn himself was interested in Pusey, and apparently predicted for him a future which showed that in this case, at any rate, the prophet was not writing history. For in September, 1826, a year after Pusey's visit, Mr. Dwight, an American student of his acquaintance, was a second time at Göttingen, and he gives Pusey an interesting account of Eichhorn, who had inquired particularly for him, and wished much to see him again. Pusey, he thought, had read enough of German theological literature to see the difference between it and that of England. In short, as he suspected, Pusey had now 'opened his eyes a little,' and 'consequences might be anticipated which it was needless to mention.'

mathie,' Pusey, 'Theol. of Germ.,' part 1, 136, note.

¹ Pusey, 'Theol. of Germ.,' part 1, 137.

² 'Theol. of Germ.,' part 1, 137, note 1; cf. 'Theol. of Germ.,' part 2, 401, note.

³ 'Daniel the Prophet,' p. 109, note 7, on the historic existence of Daniel and the Three Children; 'Minor Proph.,' p. 503, on his description of Zechariah's visions as a prosaic relation of that which the prophet sees. This representation of prophecy as the description of a picture present to the prophet's spiritual eye was constantly referred to by Dr. Pusey; cf. Eichhorn, 'Einleitg.,' n. 603, iv. pp. 435-6.

⁴ 'Daniel the Prophet,' p. 271;

'Minor Proph.,' p. 400, on the 'unnatural hypothesis that prophecies are only histories of the past spoken of as if it were still future'; cf. also 'Minor Proph.,' p. 227. So the theory that 'prophets were but poets' ('Minor Proph.,' p. 483), having no supernatural access to the future whatever (ib. p. 311, where Eichhorn, 'Einleit. A. T.,' n. 605, iv. p. 445, &c., is quoted). Pusey complains of Eichhorn's 'arbitrariness' ('Daniel,' p. 203), of the indecision of his unbelief ('Minor Proph.,' p. 263, note t; p. 511, note a). Thus he even includes Eichhorn among the 'coarser rationalists' ('Daniel,' p. 271).

⁵ 'Daniel the Prophet,' 2nd edition, Preface, p. lxxviii.

Pusey also attended Pott's lectures on the first three Gospels, with especial reference to the Jewish ideas referred to in the New Testament. David Julius Pott was now sixty-five years old: he had been Professor of Theology at Göttingen since 1810. He had written a commentary on the Catholic Epistles, and a great many monographs on single passages in Holy Scripture, particularly on St. Paul's first Epistle to the Corinthians. Without denying the supernatural on *à priori* grounds, he recognized its presence in the Bible very grudgingly; and explained it away, either by the operation of natural causes, or by the analogies of some heathen myth, constantly and without scruple¹. His lectures, if less able, were not less surprising to Pusey than Eichhorn's. All the miracles of the early part of our Lord's life were explained away. Each miracle, the lecturer said, contained some flaw, which would make it useless for the purpose of producing conviction of the truth of the Gospel in those who denied it. On the other hand, Pott defended at length the literal reality of our Lord's Resurrection. When Pusey in the following year asked Hengstenberg what he was to think of Pott, the answer implied complete disbelief as to whether any orthodox teaching could be expected from such a quarter. But Pott was only a sample of the prevalent tone. In all Germany the number of professors who then contended for the truth of the Gospel as a supernatural Revelation warranted by miracle was thought to be seventeen².

Critical Göttingen did not, in those days, think or speak very respectfully of England or the English Church. There was a current tradition in Göttingen where Heyne had lived that he attributed the non-reception in England of his theories about Homer to the English Bishops, who 'apprehended' that the principle of these theories might be applied to Holy Scripture³. The immediate effect of

¹ See his 'Excursus de descensu I. C. ad inferos,' appendix to 'Commentatio in Epistolae Catholicae,' vol. ii.

² Pusey's 'Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury,' p. 100.

³ Pusey, 'Minor Prophets,' p. 510, Intr. to Zechariah.

the atmosphere of the place upon Pusey's mind was an intense desire to work for positive truth.

'I can remember,' he said in May, 1878, 'the room in Göttingen in which I was sitting when the real condition of religious thought in Germany flashed upon me. I said to myself, "This will all come upon us in England; and how utterly unprepared for it we are!" From that time I determined to devote myself more earnestly to the Old Testament, as the field in which Rationalism seemed to be most successful.'

While at Göttingen, Pusey made friends with Christian Bunsen, who was a Professor of Philosophy, and Librarian, and some years younger than Pott. When Pusey had left Göttingen, Bunsen sent him a book of manuscript notes which a relative of his, P. L. Bunsen, had taken at the lectures of John David Michaelis in 1779¹.

Here also Pusey used to attend the Lutheran church, and he often would describe one of his experiences at its services. The preacher of the day was a Rationalist, and was engaged in showing—but in language which the educated only would understand—the general untenableness of some portion of the Gospel history. In doing this he had occasion, of course, constantly to mention the Holy Name of Jesus. The church was full of country-people or simple townfolk, and each time our Lord's Name was mentioned they bowed their heads reverently; 'evidently making each mention of our Saviour the occasion of an act of devotion to Him.' Of the drift of the sermon to which they were listening they had no idea; to them it was edifying on account of the frequent mention of our Saviour's Name. Pusey would frequently refer to this when insisting that God overrules human error so completely as, at times, to make the teachers of error

¹ Michaelis had been to Göttingen in the eighteenth century what Eichhorn had come to be at the beginning of the nineteenth. English readers of the last generation were introduced to Michaelis by Bishop Marsh. The notes in question have critical, as distinct from theological

or religious value; they are written out in a clear German hand. One set is on the Book of Job, the other on the two Epistles to the Corinthians. The book is inscribed, 'Seinem Freunde, H. Pusey, zur freundlichen Erinnerung von C. Bunsen. Göttingen, am 6. Sept. 1825.'

the unintentional servants and friends of truth¹. He thought that Christian faith was kept alive in parts of Lutheran Germany mainly by the hymns, which happily corrected the prevalent tendencies of the pulpit.

During his visit to Göttingen, Pusey was principally engaged in studying Less's work² on Miracles. He had promised Newman, who was at the time writing his celebrated article on Apollonius of Tyana, to give him an account of Less's work; and he redeemed his promise at very great length. Less's book is chiefly valuable as a repertory of facts and thoughts ready to the hand of clearer writers who might follow him. Pusey's analysis of it is painstaking and apparently exhaustive; but it is without plan or method, although abounding in interesting reflections of his own. In these is observable his disposition to restrict the range of miracle, even in Scripture; while he rejects the miracle of the African confessors who spoke without tongues, and considers the eruption of fire at the Temple of Jerusalem a natural phenomenon. The letter concludes with a reference to the new parish church of St. Clement's, Oxford, in building which Newman was at that time greatly interested.

From Göttingen Pusey went on to Berlin. He carried with him introductions which secured for him the high advantage of an acquaintance with Schleiermacher, and the friendship of Dr. G. F. A. Strauss. Berlin, however, had another and a more personal attraction for Pusey. He had made Tholuck's acquaintance in Oxford, in the early part of the year; but the close friendship which united them for long afterwards dates from Pusey's first visit to Berlin.

Augustus Tholuck, the son of a goldsmith at Breslau, was born March 30, 1799. In early life he devoted himself to the Oriental languages, and with this object removed to Berlin, where he was kindly assisted by the Prelate von Diez, whose name will be well known to

¹ Of this experience he must have been thinking in 'Theol. of Germ.,' part I, p. 179, note.

² 'Wahrheit der Christl. Rel.' von Dr. Gottfried Less. Göttingen, 1785, vol. ii. dritt. Abschn. pp. 177-472.

readers of Goethe. In boyhood he had an active repugnance to religion: 'at the age of twelve,' he writes, 'I was wont to scoff at Christianity and its truths¹.' When he left the Gymnasium at Berlin he read a paper on the superiority of Mohammedanism to Christianity. From this condition he was rescued through the influence of the excellent Baron von Kottwitz, a pious Lutheran of advanced years, who was the centre of an Evangelical circle at Berlin. His mental and theological life was more powerfully shaped by Neander². Henceforth, his rich intellectual gifts, his fervid temperament, his strenuous will, were consecrated to Christian work; he had a right at the jubilee of his degree of Licentiate, in 1870, to make Zinzendorf's saying his own,—'I have but one enthusiasm; it is He, only He³.' Tholuck throughout his mature life was, first of all, a believing practical Christian, and then a theologian. But he was a theologian of such great accomplishments as to be in many other senses highly cultured. He learnt languages with great facility. He could speak, not only the languages of modern Europe with fluency, but also Persian and Arabic. People even compared him in this respect with Cardinal Mezzofanti. He had been an experienced traveller; he had great powers of conversation; and he was welcome everywhere in German society. But he was before all things, as has been said, a man for whom theology was the expression of truths that lay nearest to his heart. His commentaries on the Romans, on St. John, on the Hebrews, on the Sermon on the Mount, and on the Psalms, have long been known to English readers: of his other works, that on Prophecy is perhaps the best, as it certainly was the most prized by Pusey⁴.

When Pusey reached Berlin, Tholuck was an 'extra-

¹ Tholuck, 'Exp. of Epistle to Romans,' Eng. transl., Edinb. 1842, vol. i. pref. p. xiii.

² The result of this happy change in Tholuck is seen in his work, which went through eight editions, 'Die Lehre von der Sünde und vom Ver-

söhner, oder die wahre Weihe des Zweiflers,' 1823.

³ 'Ich habe nur eine Passion, und die ist Er, nur Er.'

⁴ 'Die Propheten und ihre Weissagungen,' Gotha, 1861.

ordinary,' i.e. supplementary, professor of theology there. He was appointed six years previously in the place of De Wette. De Wette had been dismissed from his chair by the King for writing a letter of condolence to the mother of C. L. Sand, the murderer of Kotzebue. At the time of this appointment Tholuck was only twenty; and only twenty-six when Pusey first visited Berlin. He had just returned from the visit to England, during which he had met Pusey at Oxford. While in England he had also publicly expressed his distress at the indefinite and negative tendencies of Protestant theology in Germany. These remarks had been reproduced in Berlin, and, as a consequence, he was already an object of great hostility to the Rationalistic party. Tholuck's welcome to Pusey was hearty in the extreme. He was overwhelmed with work that had accumulated during his absence. But he offered to read German authors with Pusey daily, to lend him books, or to be of any possible service to him. He 'was but expressing his gratitude for the kindness he had experienced in England.' Pusey however valued him not only, or chiefly, for his personal kindness, but for himself. 'With no one,' he used to say, 'were my best hopes for Protestant Germany so bound up as with Tholuck.'

Frederic Ernest Daniel Schleiermacher was in 1825 the most commanding figure in the religious world of Berlin, and indeed in Protestant Germany. Born in 1768, he was now fifty-seven years of age, and at the height of his reputation. His many-sidedness and breadth of culture were remarkable even in the Berlin of sixty years ago. He was distinguished in philosophy, in philology, in general literature, in political science. In philosophy he had close affinities with Fichte, whose system he combined with elements taken from Jacobi and Schelling; he was intellectually indebted to Spinoza. He had translated, with rare success, a large part of Plato; and Plato has left his mark not merely in Schleiermacher's philosophy, but on his theology. But he had a freshness and originality that was all his own, and nearly all the more active minds in Germany

of his own or a younger generation who were engaged in theology were directly or indirectly influenced by him. It is sufficient to name Twesten, Lücke, Usteri, Baumgarten-Crusius, Nitzsche, Sack, Auberlen, Dorner, and, in a widely different sense, even Strauss and Baur. His lectures were remarkable for their clearness and precision of statement, lighted up by much brilliant eloquence. His short stature, his long white hair and beard, his keen eyes, his vivacity of manner, added to the general effect of his teaching: he was instinctively viewed as something more than a scientific theologian; men treated him as in some sense a prophet.

Of Schleiermacher's earlier theological works published when he was not more than thirty years of age, his 'Discourses on Religion' and his 'Monologues' are the most noteworthy. His sermons were distinguished by their elegance, their pointedness, their persuasiveness, their lofty moral tone, rather than by their doctrinal consistency. 'Those,' says W. von Humboldt, 'who may have read his numerous writings ever so diligently, but who have never heard him speak, must nevertheless remain unacquainted with the most rare power and the most remarkable qualities of the man. His strength lay in the deeply penetrative character of his words. It was the kindling effusion of a feeling which seemed not so much to be enlightened by one of the rarest intellects, as to move side by side with it in perfect unison¹. He was not, however, always able to resist the temptation of passionately enforcing some opinion of questionable religious value, which was already popular with his audience. He knew well how to make the most of a great opportunity. During the French occupation of Berlin his sermons were a political force; their vigour and boldness earned for him the character of a devoted patriot. He contributed not a little, by a single sermon, to the victorious campaign against France in 1813². In 1821 he published his most considerable theological work, 'The

¹ Quoted in Schleiermacher's 'Life,' transl. by F. Rowan, ii. 204.

'Characterzüge, etc. aus dem Leben des Königs von Preussen' in 'Life of Schleiermacher,' transl. Rowan, ii. 203.

Christian Faith according to the principles of the Evangelical Church,' which was intended to promote the Royal scheme of fusing the Lutheran and Reformed bodies in Prussia into a single communion.

In 1825 Schleiermacher was lecturing on the Acts of the Apostles; in 1826, when Pusey visited Berlin a second time, on St. Paul's Epistles to the Thessalonians and Galatians and the 'principles of practical theology.' Pusey eagerly attended these lectures; and it was the latter course which especially impressed him. Schleiermacher received him very kindly in private; and corresponded with him after his return to England.

Pusey often spoke in later life of his intercourse with Schleiermacher, and would describe him as a man of great earnestness and genius, who was feeling his way back from rationalism towards positive truth. Schleiermacher was 'that great man, who, whatever be the errors of his system, has done more than any other (some very few perhaps excepted) for the restoration of religious belief in Germany¹.' Not that Pusey was mistaken as to the actual amount or kind of belief which Schleiermacher had reached at the time of their intercourse. In the autumn of 1826 Pusey writes to Bishop Lloyd:—

'From Schleiermacher I hear that he intends to publish a commentary on the whole of the Epistles of St. Paul next October. Scholarship and thought may be expected from the translator of Plato; but of Christianity no more than is consistent with Pantheism. His system is very difficult to understand; but in some sermons his view of the Atonement seems the ordinary Socinian one; [his view] of the Divinity of Christ, that the Deity, who is in some measure displayed in every human being, was in a larger measure . . . revealed in Him.'

But Pusey gradually learnt to distinguish between Schleiermacher's actual belief and the direction in which, upon the whole, his mind was moving. Even Schleiermacher's mistakes were sometimes allied to the upward tendency of his thought. If he erred in making feeling alone the seat of religion in the soul, he was opposing the narrow

¹ 'Theol. Germ.' i. 115, note.

academical tendency to treat revealed religion as merely a subject for philosophical discussion, or the Kantian tendency to resolve it into mere morality. Feeling, moreover, with Schleiermacher did not mean agitated emotion, but the focus of spiritual life, the central point of thought, affection, and endeavour. The charge of Pantheism to which Schleiermacher's earlier writings are exposed is certainly not without foundation; but the language which may appear to justify it was provoked by his violent recoil from the cold deistic conception of a God, who, although personal, is too remote from the world to concern Himself with the affairs of men. If in his works on the first Epistle to Timothy and the Gospel of St. Luke¹, Schleiermacher takes up purely rationalizing positions which in after years Baur and Strauss knew well how to turn to the account of advanced unbelief, still the bias of his mind in his later years was towards an increased reverence for the Bible. And the unique position which both in his Glaubenslehre and his Discourses he resolutely claims for our Lord, in relation to the history of the world and of the single soul, is utterly incompatible with any but the Catholic Creed respecting His Person and His Work.

Since, in his estimate of Schleiermacher, Pusey thus dwelt less upon the position which he actually occupied than on the direction in which he was moving, he was indignant when Bretschneider classed Schleiermacher with writers who resolved Christian theology into the philosophy of Schelling or Hegel². The injustice of Bretschneider's view appears from the fact that Schleiermacher, whose philosophical culture was of the highest order, resolutely opposed all mingling of philosophy with theology. This feature of his thought left a permanent impression on Pusey's mind. Unlike Newman in one direction and J. B. Mozley in another, Pusey always distrusted philosophical methods of handling theology; he took refuge in authority, whether that of Scripture or of the Primitive

¹ This work was translated by Thirlwall, who prefixed to it an introduction.

² 'Theol. of Germ.' i. p. 115, note.

Church. Schleiermacher's theory, which makes religion consist altogether in a feeling of dependence on God—exaggerated though it was—powerfully appealed to elements in Pusey's character; and it is even probable that Pusey owed the beginnings of some prominent features of his devotional life to his intercourse with Schleiermacher. Schleiermacher had begun his theological studies in the Moravian College at Niesky; and although he withdrew from this community on going to Halle, he always referred gratefully to the training in piety for which he was indebted to it. The Moravian devotion to our Lord's Passion in detail—to His Blood, to His Five Wounds, to His Bloody Sweat, to the piercing of His Side, to the print of the nails—had been bitterly criticized by Bengel during Zinzendorf's lifetime; but it remains an essential feature of the Moravian piety. When Pusey afterwards discovered it in the 'Paradise of the Christian soul,' he was at home with a devotion which had long ago been at least implicitly recommended to him by Schleiermacher¹.

As a young man, he was chiefly attracted by the remarkable book in which Schleiermacher essays to provide for the wants of theological students². It had a 'few great defects': but it was also 'full of important principles and comprehensive views,' and it would, he thought, form 'a new era in theology³.' This he explained to mean, not an era in which new truths would be discovered, but in which old truths would be more accurately appreciated⁴. In his later life he used especially to refer to Schleiermacher as the utterer of maxims which it was useful to bear in mind. One such is given in the work already referred to. 'The endeavour to introduce philo-

¹ During his tour of 1719 Zinzendorf saw an *Ecce Homo* at Düsseldorf which made a deep impression on him. Below the painting were the words, 'This have I done for thee; what hast thou done for Me?' Dr. Pusey more than once mentioned being deeply impressed while in Germany by an 'Ecce Homo' with this very inscription. It was, probably,

the same picture. See Hagenbach, *German Rationalism*, p. 131, Eng. transl. On the tendencies to Rome absurdly imputed to Zinzendorf, *ibid.* p. 152.

² 'Kurze Darstellung des Theol. Studiums.' It has since been translated into English. Edinb. 1850.

³ 'Theol. of Germ.' i. 115, ii. 89.

⁴ *Ibid.* ii. 90.

sophical systems into theology is generally at variance with a correct interpretation of Scripture¹. Another, which he had taken down in lecture at Berlin, ran thus: 'Nobody would nowadays care to study the Canon of Scripture, except from dislike of revealed religion, unless he studied it from a love of the truth which it contains.' This maxim Pusey repeated more than once in conversation even in the last year of his life.

At Berlin Pusey also made the acquaintance of the Church historian, Augustus Neander. Neander was in the prime of life—thirty-six years of age. He was lecturing on 'the Characteristics of the Apostolic Age,' and on an 'Introduction' to the Fathers.

Already this fertile writer had published separate works on the Gnostic systems, on the writings of Tertullian, on the Emperor Julian and his times, on St. Chrysostom, on St. Bernard and his age. More recently he had produced his excellent *Memorabilia* of the History of Christianity. The first volume of his greatest, but unhappily unfinished, work, the 'General History of the Christian Religion and Church,' was on the eve of its appearance². It was afterwards brought to a standstill at the Pontificate of Boniface VIII. by the author's failing eyesight. Despite the earnest Christian spirit which breathes throughout it, Neander, as in later years Pusey thought, was governed by some unwarranted assumptions which did much to impair the value of his work. Writing under the influence of that strong recoil from the arid orthodox Lutheranism of the seventeenth century which was so largely shared by many of the best minds of the day, Neander read into the early history of the Church an anticipation of that 'ossification and externalization' of Christian faith and life which had actually followed upon the Reformation in Lutheran Germany³.

¹ *Kurze Darstellung des Theologischen Studiums*, p. 51, qu. 'Theol. Stud.' i. 115, note.

² The preface to the first volume is dated Berlin, Oct. 18, 1825.

³ Other works by which he is still better known in this country, such as that on the 'Planting and Training of the Church by the Apostles,' and his reply to Strauss, followed at a later date.

Neander's genuine kindness, his solid learning, his tender piety, his vivid enthusiasm, made him a general favourite; and Pusey certainly would not have shared his American friend Dwight's objection to a German professor on the score of slovenliness. Writing to Pusey in November, 1841, Neander refers to 'the relations in which you stood to me here, and the Christian communion between us, which, as I trust, cannot be lessened by some theological differences.'

It was during this visit also that Pusey first made the acquaintance of E. W. Hengstenberg, for whom he retained a warm affection throughout life. Hengstenberg was two years younger than Pusey¹; but as a Licentiate, of twenty-three, he was already lecturing on the Psalms, the Chaldee portions of Daniel, and the history of the Hebrews. Although Pusey came to think that Hengstenberg's judgment was at times seriously at fault, even in his great work on the 'Christology of the Old Testament,' he would refer to him, together with Tholuck, as perhaps the most believing of the German minds with which he had come into close contact.

Hengstenberg was from the first on intimate relations with Pusey: he bought and kept books for his English friend after Pusey's first German visit, and acted the part of a friendly correspondent at the headquarters of German literature. On the other hand, a year afterwards, we find Pusey endeavouring, at Hengstenberg's request, to interest Newman in the *Evangelical Church Gazette*, a periodical² of which Hengstenberg had then become editor. And for long years afterwards, whenever an Oxford friend might have returned from Berlin, Pusey's question was, invariably, 'Did you see or hear anything of Hengstenberg?'

At Berlin, too, Pusey fell in with the young American, already mentioned, who, like himself, was endeavouring

¹ Born at Fröndenberg, Oct. 20, 1802; 'Hengst. Leben und Werke,' by Bachmann, i. 13.

² On its objects, see Hengstenberg's 'Leben und Werke,' ii. 15.

to make acquaintance with the language and literature of Germany. Mr. Dwight was in weak health, and this enlisted Pusey's sympathy; but he was withal active and enterprising, and was interested especially in the religious aspects of German life. In his letters to Pusey he describes the Berlin professors with the unreserve and audacity of a young man, or perhaps, it may be said, of a young American. 'Neander was a sloven.' 'Strauss was a boor—a very good man, but not half so much a gentleman as one of our Indians.' 'Marheineke was a great puff-ball.' Of Schleiermacher and Tholuck he writes in more respectful terms. Dwight remained in Germany throughout the winter of 1825-6, and told Pusey from time to time what was going on. On the death of Professor Knappe at Halle, Tholuck was chosen to succeed him; and Dwight describes a ceremony which would have interested Pusey, from its relation to persons with whom he was already acquainted. Writing from Berlin on March 19, 1826, he states that Tholuck

'was initiated a few days since. . . . Schleiermacher, Tholuck, and that great puff-ball, Marheineke, delivered addresses in Latin. I endeavoured to squeeze in through the crowd, but found it impossible, and can only say that the two former are said to have acquitted themselves in fine style. The latter, I am told, sat like the Pope, as if not only the Church, but the New Jerusalem, was resting on his shoulders. It took one of the students many minutes to let out a small part of the disgust which he felt on seeing and hearing him. . . .

'Tholuck leaves here in a short time for Halle, where he will have an opportunity of measuring swords with Gesenius and Wegscheider¹.'

Pusey returned to Oxford in the middle of October. At no time had he doubted, in his own phrase, 'what to do with the life which God had given him.' Never had any other ideal of the future presented itself to his imagination, as a boy or a young man, as a serious rival to that which was offered by the Sacred Ministry of the Church.

¹ Wegscheider was at this time the most considerable representative of the older Rationalism in Halle. As

Tholuck said, with truth and humour, he was the Dogmatist of Rationalism.

'I have no idea,' he said to a friend in 1878, 'how the purpose of taking Holy Orders came into my mind. I know that nothing was said about it at home. But I remember an elder cousin, Arundel Bouverie, afterwards Archdeacon, raising the question of a profession when I was about nine years old. I said to him in the language of a boy, "Oh! I shall be a clergyman." He asked "Why?" I said, "Because it is the best thing to do." From this I have never swerved.'

Pusey had hoped to be ordained Deacon in December, 1825. The family living of Fawkham in Kent was to have been presented to him at the next vacancy. It became vacant in 1828, and in the following year his friend Mr. Salwey was presented to it by the patron.

'I must of necessity,' he writes to Mr. Salwey in 1832, 'be much interested in your success with your people, as I once thought the care of them would be the object of my own life.'

Forty years later he wrote to the same correspondent:—

'How changed things have been since those Christ Church days! You have had the lot which had been always my ideal. My life has been passed amidst storms. It matters not, so that the shore is won at last.'

This, which may be termed the original plan of Pusey's life, was first disturbed by his success at Oriel in April, 1823. During the later months of that year he was reading for the Latin Essay, and his mind was distracted by other work which duty to the college appeared to prescribe. He was indeed constantly thinking of ordination; he attended Dr. Lloyd's lectures by way of preparation for it. But if he still looked forward to clerical life, it was now to clerical life in Oxford, and when in 1824 Newman was ordained Deacon, and became, through Pusey's suggestion, Curate of St. Clement's Church, Pusey entered into his work and plans with the utmost interest¹.

It was even arranged that Pusey, when ordained upon his college title, should join his friend as a second Curate at St. Clement's. But meanwhile Pusey's correspondence with Z., and his project of refuting Dupuis, had given

¹ 'I remember,' he said in 1874, 'that the first sick person that Newman visited at St. Clement's re-

fused to see him, and shut the door against him. Newman persevered. The man died penitent.'

his plans, which were always religious, a new turn. The duty of the hour, if not on his own account, yet for the sake of others, was to make good the claims of Christianity against infidel opponents. The horizon of questions to be answered, of subjects to be explored, was widening too rapidly in Pusey's mind to allow him to prepare as yet for ordination. He read Less, that he might answer Dupuis: he learnt German that he might read the untranslated part of Less: he went to Germany that he might learn the language thoroughly, and might discover how questions could be solved which Less had suggested to him, but had not answered. He had hoped to present himself for ordination at Christmas, 1825. His German tour had resulted in an important change of plan. Writing to Mr. Salwey in November he observes:—

‘You will be surprised to hear that I have come to the resolution, after considerable and sometimes painful deliberation, to delay for some little time my going into Orders. My visit to Germany has opened to me a new line of professional study; and though I know not whether it will be of any use to any one, yet it seemed to offer a chance which did not appear to be neglected. God grant that it may turn out well. Yet I have sacrificed much immediate comfort and happiness, which acting with Newman in his large parish would have given me—perhaps improvement too. Yet it was incompatible with these pursuits, and I had some hopes that I might be thus more useful: but God only knows.’

He was in fact to wait two years and a half before this great object of his life could be attained.

During the late autumn of 1825 Pusey thus describes his occupations:—

‘I am at present employed in preparing to examine the evidence for the books of the Old Testament, but it requires a good deal of preparation; since I have nearly forgotten the little Hebrew I ever knew. And I have besides Chaldee and Syriac to learn. Do not mention my employments to any one; you see I have abundance to do.’

At the beginning of Lent Term, 1826, Pusey went into rooms in Oriel College. The set which he occupied was on the middle floor in the corner of the college nearest to Canterbury Gate, Christ Church; the bedroom window

looked towards Corpus, the sitting-room towards Christ Church. His friends, who anticipated high office in the Church for a man of Pusey's station, character, and industry, used to say jokingly, 'You are looking towards Canterbury.' When telling the story to a friend shortly before his death he added an expression of deep thankfulness to Almighty God for 'His great goodness in sparing me any such trial as a Bishopric.'

In the first week of Hilary Term, 1826, the University was distracted by a contested election. Mr. Richard Heber had resigned his seat in Parliament; Mr. T. G. B. Estcourt of Corpus Christi College and Sir C. Wetherell of Magdalen College were candidates for the honour of representing the University. Pusey's political sympathies were Liberal: but he cared more for character than for political opinions. This will explain his view of the merits of the candidates; and the following letter possesses an interest which is independent of its political value. Pusey is writing to Parker, and hopes that the approaching election will at any rate have the effect of bringing him up to Oxford.

'Feb. 5, 1826.

'About the result of the election, I own I do not care much. If Mr. Estcourt is elected we shall have a thoroughly respectable country gentleman, of respectable talents also; if Sir C. Wetherell, the University will be justly punished for the slight it has offered to one of the most distinguished statesmen of his day, one who has done much for his country, and unquestionably the first of her own members. You, however, may in heart be one of the delinquents who would have excluded Canning, and therefore think yourself bound to make reparation by excluding a man who shifted his party in the most disgraceful manner from the extreme of Toryism to the most offensive Radicalism, sought the defence of Watson as a source of annoyance, and defended the late Queen, as the tenderest part he could wound; and though he is now Ministerial and anti-Catholic, might, I suppose, become the reverse as soon as it became his interest to do so. I have no inclination, however, to write Philippics against Sir C. W. The shame which I should feel as a member of the University, at his election, would be much mitigated, perhaps have some little enjoyment of *νέμεσις*, at the result. By revisiting Oxford at this time you might perhaps see many whom you would not otherwise easily meet again, though indeed I should rather suspect the assemblage will not be very great, since it is a negative contest, there being dislike on one side

and indifference on the other. Here (at Oriel), however, they are very warm; the Provost has been particularly active, partly perhaps because a son of Mr. E., who was here (after you probably), was a great favourite. Peel has said that if the University were to have a country gentleman they could not have a better person. Here you will find staying, of those you know, probably me alone, who am also *ultimus meorum*. Enough of this. Jelf's appointment is too full of prospects of extensive utility and comfort to himself for me not to feel grateful for it. I need not say that (now that I am at last within college walls) I shall expect, if you come, that you will sleep within my rooms. I know not what your avocations are. The election will be in about ten days probably.'

In the event Mr. Estcourt was returned as the colleague of Sir Robert Peel. The brief interval of political fever being over, Oxford residents returned to the subjects which generally occupied them.

Oriel, and Pusey in particular, were greatly interested in the fortunes of another member of the society, R. W. Jelf. After an offer to Newman, which has been humorously described and discussed by Mr. T. Mozley¹, Dr. Lloyd had offered to Jelf the post of tutor to Prince George of Cumberland. To Pusey this appointment was at once a satisfaction and a sorrow. He was losing the companionship of his oldest friend. He was overjoyed at the wide prospects of usefulness which were opening before one who was, he believed, so capable of making the most of them. The letter of introduction to his American friend, Mr. H. E. Dwight, is couched in the warmest terms of regard for Jelf and appreciation of his high abilities—'I need not say, far superior to my own,'—and concludes with a characteristic postscript, 'It has just occurred to me that I have not told you my friend's name. It is "Jelf"; he is in Orders.'

Pusey's Old Testament studies were for a short time interrupted by a work which he began under the sanction, if not at the suggestion, of Dr. Lloyd. This was a translation of Hug's 'Introduction to the New Testament.' Hug, who was for many years a Theological Professor at the

¹ 'Oriel College and the Oxford Movement,' 2nd ed., i. 33, 34.

Catholic University of Freiburg-im-Breisgau, and who in March 1846 died as Dean of Freiburg Cathedral, was already well known to Europe as one of the acutest critics of the naturalistic school of criticism. His method was severely historical: his quarrel with Paulus and other writers was chiefly on the score of their arbitrariness. The library of Freiburg furnished him with but scanty materials for his projected 'Introduction,' so he employed his vacations in the troubled years of 1798-1801 in visiting those of Vienna, Munich, and Paris. In 1808 his 'Introduction' appeared; it ran through four editions; and was hailed as a solid contribution to Biblical studies by Protestant as well as Roman Catholic theologians. The book had already been translated into French some six years before; and there were sufficient reasons for putting it into the hands of the English public. Pusey, however, had not made much way in his work when he discovered that he had been anticipated by a Cambridge scholar, Dr. Wait, the Rector of Blagdon in Somersetshire. He explains his abandonment of the task when writing to Dr. Lloyd in June:—

'June 10, 1826.

'If you have looked at Rivington's last catalogue you will have seen the untimely end of my translation of Hug. Every employment gains so much on one, by the mere pursuing it, that I abandoned it with some regret; but I found that Dr. Wait had made considerable progress in his translation last October; that he is going to publish it with notes; that he has been for years residing at Cambridge for the sake of books, which he seldom leaves; that he has the reputation of being a good Arabic scholar, and one of the best Syriac scholars of the age; so that I was glad that I had but just finished the first half-sheet of my translation.'

Dr. Wait had heard that he was not alone in the field, and had hurried on his work at the cost of its completeness. This led Pusey to doubt whether, after all, he ought not to resume his task; a doubt which the appearance of Dr. Wait's work in the summer of 1827 finally set at rest.

In June, 1826, Oriel College celebrated the fifth centenary of its foundation. It may safely be said that on no previous occasion of the kind had the college contained so many

names destined to become celebrated. Keble, Newman, and Pusey were all Fellows, and were all present. The ample entertainment led Pusey to express a feeling which he entertained throughout life, and which largely coloured his conduct and teaching.

‘When I first knew him,’ said Cardinal Newman in 1882, ‘he used to regret the luxury of Oxford. At the centenary we had a great dinner, and, among other luxuries, turtle soup. It made Pusey very angry. I remember his coming to me and bursting out, “What is this stuff that they are going to give us?”’

That was not all.

‘In those days French wines, now so common, were considered a great luxury. It was proposed to have French wines at table, besides port and sherry. Pusey and I agreed to oppose the plan; and we carried our point in a Fellows’ meeting. But the Provost, Copleston, forthwith said that he should give French wines on his own account. On which Pusey said to me that Oxford seemed incapable of being reformed.’

CHAPTER V.

SECOND VISIT TO GERMANY—LECTURES AT BERLIN —
ARABIC STUDIES — KOSEGARTEN — LIFE AT BONN —
FREYTAG — LÜCKE — SACK — PUSEY'S RELIGIOUS IN-
FLUENCE — DEATH OF YOUNGEST BROTHER — OVER-
WORK — DR. LLOYD, BISHOP OF OXFORD.

1826-1827.

'Ardua molimur: sed nulla, nisi ardua, virtus.
Difficilis nostrâ poscitur arte labor.'

OVID, *Ars Am.* ii. 537-8.

PUSEY'S first visit to Germany had whetted without satisfying his appetite for the studies which were now more and more identified with the central purpose of his life. He had been working for some time at Hebrew; and he already knew that a real knowledge of Hebrew requires a background of Arabic and the other cognate languages. His mind was also largely at work upon those questions concerning the authority and trustworthiness of the Sacred Scriptures, to which a knowledge of the Oriental tongues is ancillary; and he had made up his mind that a second and longer visit to Germany was already necessary. In December, 1825, he tells his brother that nothing was fixed as to a second visit; but that he thought of going in June and returning in September. He had written to Dwight at Berlin, asking him to ascertain from Tholuck where he could best study Syriac. The purpose grew steadily as the spring of 1826 advanced. It was fostered, or rather brought to a practical issue, by Dr. Lloyd. In Lloyd's generous conception of his own office, it was not merely his duty to teach theology, but to encourage and assist younger men who gave promise of theological excellence; and he had no doubt about Pusey. 'Lloyd sent me

to Germany,' Pusey would say in later years; and this was so far true that, but for Dr. Lloyd, the second, longer, and in every way more important visit would never in all probability have taken place. At last the resolution was taken somewhat suddenly: although, at one moment, it seemed not unlikely to be abandoned. In those days a visit to Germany involved a comparatively serious separation from home; and Pusey's father was now 81 years of age. He had been recently unwell; and to leave England without his entire approval could not be thought of. Mr. Pusey told his son that in any circumstances he should be unwilling to interfere with plans designed with a view to his improvement; but that, as matters stood, there was no reason, 'more than ordinary,' for remaining in England.

Pusey left England on June 17th for Berlin, and soon found himself among old friends. Neander was lecturing on early Ecclesiastical History and the two later groups of St. Paul's Epistles. Schleiermacher was setting forth the Principles of Practical Theology, and explaining the Epistles to the Thessalonians and the Galatians. Among younger men, Hengstenberg—now an Extraordinary Professor—had begun to lecture on Genesis, and to give private lectures in Syriac; while Bleek and Ullman were engaged, the first on Biblical exposition, the second on Church History before the Reformation. Pusey attended most of these lectures—certainly those of Schleiermacher, Neander, and Hengstenberg. In visiting Germany the second time, 'I went,' he says, 'with the double purpose of acquainting myself further with the German theology, and of learning the cognate dialects of Hebrew'; and his attendance at lectures was regulated by this double object.

The summer of 1826 was a very warm one, and during the latter part of the term the heat of Berlin proved very trying to Pusey¹. As soon as term was over he escaped into the country, and took a lodging close to Schönhausen, a palace belonging to the King of Prussia,

¹ 'So hot it was, that at midnight the streets of Berlin seemed to be burning,' he used to say.

and lent by the King, for the summer, to the Duke of Cumberland. Here Jelf was hard at work as tutor to Prince George; and the Duke, with the consideration that marked all his dealings with his son's instructor, suggested to Jelf that his friend Pusey should live as near the palace as he could. The friends, however, could only meet at irregular times, as Jelf's day was pretty well taken up.

'The hours here,' Jelf writes to Dr. Lloyd, 'are very early. I dine regularly with the Prince at two o'clock. Although there are usually many visitors each day, yet we live on the whole quite a domestic life, as the dinner parties generally break up at five or six. Every evening I read to the Duke and Duchess some English book for about an hour. I have at present not much time without interruption for my own reading, as it is expected that I should spend the greatest part of the day with the Prince. . . . I believe you have heard from Pusey that he has taken lodgings in the same village. He has received many attentions from this family, and we constantly meet in our walks. He is reading very hard. So long as he is here it is superfluous for me to offer my services to you for obtaining books or information, but when he is gone I shall hope to be occasionally useful.'

Pusey followed his friend's occupations with the closest sympathy, although his own work was sufficiently exacting. On reaching Berlin he had at once plunged into Syriac and Chaldee, mainly, as it would seem, under the guidance of Hengstenberg. When he went to Schönhausen he set to work at Arabic. He had begun the language with Dr. Macbride at Oxford, and he now engaged the services of Herr Salomon Munk, who had studied Eastern languages at Paris under Chézy and de Sacy, and was then living in Berlin, and afterwards had a distinguished literary career in Paris.

Munk used to come out from Berlin to Schönhausen five times a week, and on each occasion he gave Pusey a lecture of two hours' length. Pusey at this date spent from fourteen to sixteen hours a day working at Arabic. The vast vocabulary of that language; the 'almost endless multiplicity of meanings assigned by the dictionaries to separate words'; the similarity of sound in many of the root-forms which makes it so difficult for a beginner to distinguish

them from each other; and the ancient, varied, and extensive literature, made a very serious effort necessary—so Pusey used to say—if a man wished to be a good Arabist. ‘It was worth while,’ he added, ‘to be an Arabist that perchance something more might be known about the Sacred Language, than would otherwise have been possible.’ But Pusey had to fall back again and again on this constraining motive, in order to keep himself up to the prescribed measure of exertion.

‘The great sacrifice,’ so he wrote seven years afterwards, ‘or, at least, what was to me such [in mastering Arabic], is that you must employ much of the time on non-Christian literature which you would have wished to bestow on the direct study of God’s Holy Word. This was to me, again and again, in my course of study, matter of pain and almost hesitation and misgiving; but, this sacrifice made, everything else appeared to lie in the line of duty.’

But Pusey was not engaged only in the study of Oriental languages. Dr. Lloyd had asked him to furnish him with a complete list of the modern German commentators on St. Paul, and of the estimate which had been formed of them in Germany. Two months had passed and Pusey in a lengthy letter sends him the desired information, and adds:—

‘Berlin, Aug. 29, 1826.

‘Accident has brought me much nearer to Jelf than I should have conceived to be possible; but the excessive heat of Berlin, which had been long oppressing me, compelling me at last to leave it, I have taken a lodging (at the Duke’s recommendation) within 200 yards of the palace in which he is living, about four English miles from Berlin. The Professors with whom I was principally acquainted had previously just left it, and a language-teacher gives me lectures of two hours five times a week here, so that I am nearly as well off, even in this point, as if in Berlin itself. This vicinity to Jelf has been particularly gratifying, in that I have been enabled myself to see the kindness and regard shown to him by the family generally, and the real attachment which the boy seems to feel towards him. . . .

‘Till the middle of this month I was employed (after a good deal of disappointment and uncertainty) in Syriac and Chaldee together (the languages being nearly the same). My Syriac instructor then left me, suddenly; and I cannot find one who will be at liberty

before the middle of October. I have in the meantime recommenced Arabic, of which I had almost forgotten the little I ever learnt, though I have retained enough to be saved the first drudgery of a new language. I am promised that if I continue these studies till about the end of December with the assistance which I have here, besides a respectable knowledge of Syriac and Chaldee with as much Rabbinic as is necessary to read the best Jewish commentators, I shall have sufficiently mastered the difficulties of Arabic to be able without further sacrifice of time to avail myself of the aids to the interpretation of the Old Testament from the cognate languages. . . .

'My plan is, if you think it advisable, after continuing Arabic here till towards the middle of September, to read then a more difficult Syriac historian (Bar-Hebraeus) with Professor Kosegarten (an eminent Orientalist) in Greifswald; then to return here till the end of November, in which time, besides assistance in Arabic and Rabbinic, I shall hear (which I am anxious to hear) a solution from a good theologian and Hebraist of the difficulties raised as to the authenticity of the later chapters of Isaiah; and after that to spend a month in Bonn, if, as I hope, I can obtain private lectures from a Professor there (the first Arabic scholar in Germany), returning a little before the recommencement of your lectures in the middle of January. . . .'

At a later period of his stay, Dr. Lloyd commissioned Pusey to make inquiries about the Catechism of Justus Jonas and the text of the Augsburg Confession: on both these points, Pusey sent him elaborate replies.

In September, Pusey left Schönhausen for Greifswald. He was glad to escape from the heat and dust of Berlin to the breezy shores of the Baltic, but he was also attracted by the name of Professor Kosegarten, an Oriental scholar of high distinction. Tholuck in vain endeavoured to persuade him to settle at Halle.

DR. A. THOLUCK TO E. B. P.

[Translated.]

Sept., 1826.

I have a great longing to see you, my dear beloved friend. I shall come to Pankow to-morrow, and I beg you to go to Prediger Weiss, and let him send for me. . . . I hear you want to go to Greifswald for the sake of your Arabic and other studies. Will you not choose Halle instead? You can have public and private instruction from Gesenius; and if you wish for my assistance in Arabic or any other language I am willing at your service. Your company at Halle would give me

so much pleasure that I should readily do all I could to make your visit useful and agreeable. Think it over. Perhaps you will change your plan, and gladden me with your society at Halle. More, then, by word of mouth. With all my heart,

Yours,

A. THOLUCK.

But this proposal came too late. Pusey had already made his arrangements with Kosegarten; and he set out for Greifswald to read Arabic and Syriac for some weeks.

Kosegarten, in whose hands he now placed himself, had studied divinity at Greifswald, and then, like so many other young Germans of his day, had gone to Paris to learn Eastern languages from Silvestre de Sacy. After remaining in Paris during the last two years of the First Empire, he returned to lecture at Greifswald in philosophy, theology, and Church history. But his true line was the study of language. In 1817 he became Professor of Oriental Languages at Jena; and although in 1824 he had returned to Greifswald as Professor of Theology, his chief interest was still linguistic.

With this distinguished scholar Pusey read the Syriac historian, Bar-Hebraeus, but he devoted most of his time to Arabic. Kosegarten was at work on his Arabic Chrestomathy, and he was preparing his edition of the Taberi Annals. In these enterprises he commanded his pupil's warm sympathies. When Pusey returned to England he enlisted subscribers for the Annals; and he makes honourable mention of both works in his continuation of Dr. Nicoll's Arabic Catalogue. In Arabic he read the Life of Saladin with Kosegarten, who (as he tells a younger friend, for his encouragement) although one of the first two Arabists in Europe, often 'had to turn out words in the dictionary,' though he never was at fault about construction. During his stay at Greifswald, Pusey lived with the family of the warm-hearted professor. He made great friends with his little boy, Gottfried, and taught him fragments of English. 'The little one,' wrote Kosegarten, in 1828, 'still remembers the two English words, "pear" and "apple," which he learnt from you.' His

wife, his brother-in-law Grädener, his eldest boy, all looked upon Pusey as a friend whom they could trust and love. Pusey was too deeply indebted to Kosegarten not to regret that his visit to Greifswald was necessarily so brief.

The Professor corresponded with Pusey for some years, mainly on subjects connected with Arabic literature and his own efforts in relation to it. He encouraged Pusey to engage in a new translation of the Old Testament. That he understood Pusey's deepest interests is plain from his recommending the second fasciculus of the Taberi Annals on the ground of its account of the first invasion of Mesopotamia by the forces of Islâm, and of the sufferings of the Christians. He was delighted at the completion of Nicoll's Arabic Catalogue by Pusey, and warmly recommended it in Germany; and he made considerable demands upon Pusey's time in relation to the Arabic MSS. in the British Museum and at Oxford. His letters are rarely wanting in the domestic element and signs of mutual personal interest.

After a two months' stay at Greifswald, Pusey returned to Berlin in the middle of November. There he received letters from Hawkins and Newman, urging him to undertake for two years the duties of a tutorship at Oriel. The Provost, Dr. Copleston, desired it. Promotion had lately weakened the teaching staff at Oriel: Tyler had become Rector of St. Giles' in the Fields, Jelf was at Berlin. Before writing to Pusey, his Oxford correspondents had extracted from Dr. Lloyd some expression of opinion to the effect that it would be 'useful, or, at least, not unadvisable,' for Pusey to accept the offer. Pusey was in great perplexity, and wrote to Dr. Lloyd, as usual, for counsel. He hoped that the College would sanction his proposal to undertake a theological lectureship—as distinct from the classical tutorship: otherwise he offered to resign his fellowship rather than give up his Oriental studies.

In a letter to Newman, Pusey explains himself in the same sense as to Dr. Lloyd, but states more fully his plans, feelings, and ideas.

E. B. P. TO REV. J. H. NEWMAN.

Berlin, Nov. 25, 1826.

As Hawkins will receive a letter by the same post which brings you this, containing the only two offers which, much as I regret it, under the circumstances I can make, the only purport of this letter is to convey you my sincerest thanks for the kindness of yours, for the high grounds upon which you have rested your wish for my compliance, and for your friendly anticipations of the mutual interest with which we should act together. My letter to Hawkins was so filled with other explanations that I had not room at the last to thank him for the similar expressions of kindness in his. I do strongly feel them; and I do hope that what I have offered to undertake may be considered sufficient to enable me to act with you. I fear that you will particularly feel the conditions which I have been obliged to annex; yet you will not require theological lectures equally with myself: your private studies have been, and will be, more theological than mine; you are more in the habit of teaching other things, and have more power of abstracting yourself from them when not actually engaged in them. The labours for Oriel, the subsequent ill-health and weakness, the time expended on the Essay, the unfortunate circumstances of my friend, and the consequent examination of Dupuisianism, the immediately ensuing study of German, the subsequent application to Hebrew, Chaldee, Syriac, and Arabic, have made my studies miserably desultory, and kept me at a distance from the core of Theology. You, too, in making your private reading theological, would have nothing to abandon. If my public tuition were not theological, my private reading must be, and this would involve the loss of my past labours, and how or when I could recover them I know not; probably never. In England we have no idea of the time which is usually employed, and which ought to be employed, on these languages. Hebrew is here universally commenced at school, probably at fourteen; Arabic frequently a year or two later, at all events at the University; we think twenty-two or twenty-three a proper time for entering on the study of the language of one portion of our Scriptures, and if the rest are learnt at all, they necessarily follow at a still later period. Yet I will not weary you with these complaints; I only mention the subject in my excuses. Learnt at this period, their natural difficulty of retention is of course beyond measure increased; and unless I bestow still a considerable portion of time upon them, I shall infallibly lose them; and with them should lose the power of executing what I have most at heart, and only have at heart, because I hope it will be useful. More of this in my letter to Hawkins. If, however, as I propose, I were made Theological Lecturer, I should of course take the greatest interest in the lectures, would spare no pains to make them useful, and yet should probably have time to keep up in some measure these languages. This I should really like: I should be glad of some active

employment; I should be glad also of the stimulus it would give to my own mind; of the opportunity it would give me of correcting my miserable deficiency in expressing myself; and not least, I can assure you, to be enabled thereby to mitigate, however partially, the labours of my friends. With the consciousness of these advantages, I might perhaps be expected to offer more, yet no one but myself can know the structure of my mind and memory, nor see how fatal my undertaking more would be to my object. I need not tell you that I shall take a deep interest in the most important, the moral, part of the office—to do my best for those more especially committed to my care, or to give any quantity of my time to those who attend my lectures, and wish to consult me on points connected with them. . . .

I hope that I need not say that I should introduce no German Theology into my lectures; and on points upon which I should have any difficulties I know my colleagues and Dr. Lloyd would be ready to give me their advice, and I should certainly consult them. I should also of course combine the reading of the best, the most orthodox, and most right-minded of our own divines.

You will be glad to hear that I am satisfied on some points, on which I have mentioned to you that I did not see my way clearly—such as the genuineness of the whole of Daniel, and the application to our Saviour of some of the Psalms—to which I before saw difficulties. My having felt these difficulties will not probably be an objection to my being entrusted with the office I propose, as had they not been removed, God forbid that I should ever have unsettled the opinion of another upon them.

I have not been able to execute your commission about the Fathers in the manner in which I wished. The only two I have yet purchased are Chrysostom (Francf.), 12 vols., I think, for £3; Theodoret, £1 4s. (at Bohn, £5 5s.). An auction, however, is approaching in which I shall probably bid for Cotelier. Patr. Apostol., Clem. Alex. (Sylb.), Tertullian (Rigalt), Hist. Eccl. (Vales.), Greg. Naz. (Col.), Cyril Jerus. (Milles, Oxon), Cyprian (Joann. Ep., Oxon), Optatus (Paris), Jerome (Fref. u. M.), Irenæi fragm. anecdot. ed. Pfaff, and possibly Augustine (Bened.), but your namesake here is so anxious to possess it, and some of his pupils to give it him, that if they collect sufficient to purchase it, as you do not immediately want it, I must give it up to them. As Jelf will probably remain some time here, there will probably be many other opportunities of procuring it. I also bid for a Plotinus for you, and some smaller Fathers. Should you not wish for some of these purchases, some I should very readily keep myself, others I could easily exchange¹. I rejoice to hear that you are learning Hebrew, and that you already relish it. I need not say that I shall be glad to give you any assistance in my power. I even think, if my other offer is

¹ Newman is probably referring to these purchases in his 'Letters and Correspondence,' i. 169: 'The fathers

are arrived all safe. Hnge fellows they are, but very cheap. One folio cost a shilling.' Oct. 18, 1827.

accepted, of proposing a voluntary Hebrew lecture, if approved of, within the College, as I think many might come to me who would be alarmed at going to Nicoll; but I must feel my way and my strength first, as I should give a good deal of time to the preparation of the other lectures: teaching, however, is one of the best ways of acquiring accuracy in a language, as indeed in everything. You will be glad to hear that Jelf has finally determined upon learning it also; and the final formation of his resolution was owing to your letter.

I had almost forgotten to say that the only part of my letter to Hawkins about which Jelf hesitated, was my offer under any circumstances to resign my Fellowship. I told him that I did not think, as I had guarded it, that it could be misconstrued into anything but a sincere wish that if I could not serve Oriel by my presence, but could by vacating my Fellowship to one who could, that, however I should regret the bond which joins us, for the sake of Oriel I should wish to do it. I do not think this a nugatory offer, and if the College will be better served thus than by my undertaking the Theological department, I myself entreat it may be done.

In this state of uncertainty, if my rooms are changed, pray let — . . . be informed that he is on no account to abate a single penny in his valuation of furniture to be paid for by a Fellow, as he is reported to have stated to Des Vœux it has been his practice to do. . . .

Would you have the kindness to ask Dornford to be so good as to pay for me, if he has any money of mine, £5 5s., or if there is any larger donation than this at Oxford, £10 10s., to the Christian Knowledge Society Schools in India, and £2 2s. annually, or if there is any larger subscription, more. . . .

Pray express my sincere regrets to Ogilvie that I have accidentally proved thus unworthy and useless a Secretary to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel¹. If, however, I am continued, I will endeavour to be more efficient next year.

This letter faintly expresses what I mean, but I am wearied by the sleeplessness of the last nights. . . .

The answer to this proposal reached Pusey at Bonn. He waited for it with an anxiety which he does not disguise from Newman. Jelf had encouraged him to hope that the answer would be favourable; and he pictured to himself the satisfaction of 'at last commencing an active life,' of improving himself by having to teach others *vivâ voce*, and 'possibly of amending the ill habits which I early

¹ It is to be noticed that Newman's interest was at this time enlisted in the work of the Church Missionary Society; he was elected the Oxford

Secretary of this Society in 1829. 'Letters and Correspondence of J. H. N.,' i. 143, 215.

and imperceptibly contracted, of a broken and indistinct delivery.' The Fellows of Oriel, however, did not entertain his proposal favourably. They wanted a classical tutor; and as Pusey was not to be had, they were considering the claims of Mr. Hurrell Froude and Mr. R. I. Wilberforce. Pusey was much disappointed. 'The lectures,' he wrote to Newman, 'are in better hands; though I again sink into practical inactivity, without at present a prospect of altering it.' As he was still working at Arabic fourteen hours a day, his 'practical inactivity' was not so serious a calamity as the expression might seem to suggest. In reply to a gentle rebuke from Newman for low spirits, from which he supposed Pusey to be still suffering, Pusey adds:—

'Jan. 9, 1827.

'Thank you for the hortatory parts of your letter, though they are more applicable to what I was when I left England than what I am now. . . . I do not now, however, suffer from those fits of depression of spirits which oppressed me during the last six months in England; God be thanked, partly through prayer, in some measure perhaps because my objects are not so immediately before my eyes, and I am absent from the scenes of active employment, which I am sacrificing perhaps for an imaginary end; partly from impressing on my mind that if these two weak arms fail of their object, God has thousands of better labourers who are cultivating His vineyard. Through these means, but principally through the first, the return of these attacks became less frequent, and yielded when they did come more rapidly; they now visit me seldom, and I am upon the whole comfortable.'

In visiting Germany Pusey had from the first proposed to attend the lectures of Professor Freytag, at Bonn, who became, if he had not become, the first Arabist in Europe. This intention would have been strengthened by Pusey's intercourse with Munk and Kosegarten; and before returning from Greifswald to Berlin in November, he had opened communications with Freytag.

Freytag was thirty-nine years old and almost at the height of his great reputation. He had studied theology and the Oriental languages at Göttingen and Paris. In 1819 he became Professor of Oriental Languages in the University of Bonn, and in 1826 he was deeply

engaged on the great work of his life, his Arabic Lexicon—the publication of which began in 1830, and was completed in 1837.

Pusey reached Bonn on December 5th; and besides attending Freytag's public lectures, went to him also for private instruction in Arabic. They used to read together the *Life of Timur*¹ and the *Hamasa*, which Freytag was editing. He soon came to be on intimate terms with the great Arabist, whom he associated with Kosegarten, and to whom, both in private and in public, he ever acknowledged his indebtedness².

For many years after Freytag was duly informed of all that went on at Pusey and in Oxford, and his pupil was admitted to share his own domestic hopes and not a few of his financial anxieties.

Freytag introduced Pusey to several remarkable persons, among others to Ewald. In the German Universities, the student who makes the necessary arrangements between the professor and his class is called his 'famulus.' The famulus is generally the professor's best pupil. Ewald was Freytag's famulus, and Freytag recommended him to Pusey as a companion with whom he would find it useful to read Hebrew and Arabic. They were at the time very intimate; Ewald was delighted when Pusey became Hebrew professor, and wrote warmly in praise of his Arabic Catalogue. In later life they were indeed widely separated; and when Ewald last visited Professor Max Müller at Oxford, he hesitated to call at Christ Church, not knowing whether Pusey would like to see him 'after all that they

¹ Bibl. Bodl. Cod. MSS. Orient. Catalogus, pt. 2, vol. 2, praef. p. iii: 'Litteris scilicet Arabicis impensè studueram, si quā ad linguam sacram codicemque adeo Divinum melius intelligendum, utilitatis aliquid inde perciperem; bibliographiam vero et biographiam Arabicam prorsus neglexeram.' It will be seen that 'neglexeram' is merely a relative expression.

² Bibl. Bodl. Cod. MSS. Orient. Cat., pt. 2, vol. 2, p. v: 'Laborem

autem hunc nostrum (i.e. the Arabic Catalogue) ad finem producere nequeo quin gratias easque maximas agam viris illis celeberrimis J. G. L. Kosegarten et G. W. Freytag, quorum ope in his literis ediscendis, illius quidem brevius quam voluissem, hujus autem diutius, uti mihi concessum est; utriusque vero summa, quā me exceperunt quamque continuo praestarent, benevolentia perpetuo animo meo fixa manebit.'

had written about each other¹. Pusey was at the moment away from Oxford, but when Professor Max Müller told him on his return about Ewald's scruples he laughed heartily, and said that he should have been delighted to see him again.

But although Pusey's work at Bonn was mainly if not altogether philological, its influence upon him was by no means confined to the sphere of scholarship. The theological faculty at Bonn was penetrated, nay ruled, however indirectly, by the commanding influence of Schleiermacher. Nitzsch, Sack, and Lücke—but especially Lücke—were at once the disciples and, each in his own sense, the interpreters of the master at Berlin; and during his seven months' residence Pusey became more or less intimate with the entire staff of Protestant theological professors at Bonn. Certainly by far the most interesting theologian of the school of Schleiermacher with whom Pusey became acquainted at Bonn was G. C. F. Lücke, who had been Professor of Theology there since 1818. Lücke was, perhaps, beyond any other of Schleiermacher's pupils, his interpreter to the rising generation. In 1827 Lücke was only 34 years old; but his career was already distinguished. He had his hands full of literary work besides his lectures, and he endeavoured to engage Pusey in the compilation of 'a Theological Encyclopaedia and Methodology.' Pusey—as Lücke thought—knew enough of German theology to carry out the idea. In this way he would serve both the English and the German Churches, and would vindicate the latter from the charges to which it was exposed in England. Lücke seems to have thus given one of the suggestions which led Pusey a year later to write his first book on the theology of Germany. They corresponded for some time. But as years went on, their theological paths diverged; Pusey was getting less and less able to follow him: but he heard of Lücke's death in 1855 with sincere sorrow; he had a 'vivid memory of Lücke's kindness and his genius.'

¹ Cf. Pusey, 'Daniel the Prophet' (2nd ed.), pref., lxvi sq., xci.

But there was another of the professors at Bonn, less eminent in after years than those already mentioned, but more definite in his religious faith. This was Karl Heinrich Sack, who after studying law at Göttingen, had read theology under Schleiermacher. After the peace of 1814 he visited England, and on returning to Berlin he published his 'Views and Considerations on Religion and the Church in England¹.' After taking his doctor's degree at Berlin, he became in 1818 assistant professor and in 1823 full professor at Bonn, where he was also Pastor of the Lutheran Congregation from 1819 to 1839.

Sack was a disciple of Schleiermacher, but he had more respect than his master for the authority of the Old Testament, and he took fewer liberties with the traditional teaching of the Lutheran body. Although he was not a man of the ability and accomplishments of Lücke and Freytag, his practical religious seriousness would have won Pusey's respect and affection; and during the spring of 1827 they became intimate with each other. Sack's letters to Pusey are full of warm affection, and they freely and naturally express his genuine piety and keen interest in the cause of religion. Pusey was often at his home, the appointments of which were simple and unpretending. It was natural that Pusey should turn to a friend with whom he was thus intimate, and who knew more of England than any one else in Bonn, when in the following year he was anxious to show, in reply to Mr. Rose's lectures, what he considered to be the true character of German theology.

Of other prominent men with whom Pusey was well acquainted at Bonn were Augusti, who became an authority on Liturgical Antiquities; Gieseler, the celebrated Church historian; and the celebrated Aristotelian scholar, C. A. Brandis, who was now engaged with E. Bekker upon the great critical edition of the works of Aristotle which appeared at Berlin in 1831.

Pusey's visit to Bonn had other features than the

¹ 'Ansichten und Beobachtungen über Religion und Kirche in England,' Berlin, 1818.

intellectual aspects of academical life might suggest. He saw more of German domestic life and society than at Berlin or Greifswald. He had some difficulty in keeping out of duels, then as now common among students in a German University. During his walks into the country he sometimes forgot, through absence of mind, or rather through preoccupation with his studies, to observe the rule of the road, and this was looked upon by some fiery young Germans as an intended insult. He was challenged on more than one occasion, but there must be two parties to a duel as to any other sort of quarrel, and his antagonist was softened and amused by discovering the true state of the case. With several students, however, he was on terms of intimacy, and particularly with a young Dane, who, like himself, was interested in Oriental studies, L. N. Boisen. Boisen was a serious and hardworking student, and a man of warm and affectionate disposition. When he made Pusey's acquaintance he was living a careless life; he describes his own character as 'not entirely barren, but overgrown with thorns and thistles.' From this indifference or worse he was rescued by the influence of his English friend. They were on the most familiar terms, and read for Freytag's lectures in each other's company; but the main substance and result of their intercourse is best described in Boisen's own words:—

'Your pious working in my poor neglected soul has not remained without blessings. I should be most ungrateful towards the heavenly Ruler of my paths if I did not first of all say loudly, nay rejoicingly, that you have in me saved an erring soul, and have led it to the one good Shepherd. . . . Truly, I look to you as to him who has begotten me in Christ Jesus through the Gospel. . . . I must hope that you whom God has chosen to awake and bring to life my better self, might also be destined to protect and foster whatever is good in me.'

While Pusey was at Bonn he used to make time for visiting the sick and poor. When his eldest niece was travelling in Germany after her father's death in 1855, she discovered some interesting traces of this:—

'When at Bonn in 1855 I gave my name at a shoemaker's shop, and

A woman asked if I was related to the great Professor. Rather surprised, I said yes, and asked why she inquired. She brightened up, and said that while he was there as a student her mother had been very ill, and that he used to come and read and pray with her.'

Although absent from England he did not forget home. His brother William was ten years his junior, and was now about leaving Eton for Oriel. Pusey always had a kind of paternal relation to him, and the following fragments of a very lengthy letter, illustrating this relation, cannot be read without interest.

E. B. P. TO W. B. PUSEY.

Bonn, Dec. 9, 1826.

While I remained in England, and we had constant opportunities of seeing each other at intervals not very distant, our filling up those intervals by corresponding was less necessary, and I therefore indulged my own occupation and your idleness in not pressing it. Now, however, that my stay abroad is again so long protracted, all communication between us is thus cut off: this should not be. At your age each year makes so much alteration that I should have my acquaintance with a great part of you to make for the first time, and you would think me grown old and grave at once. At this important period, too, of your life, when you are throwing off boyhood and beginning in real earnest the preparations for your future usefulness, it will be useful to you to have near you a friend somewhat older. . . . The more I know of your occupations the more I submit the better—what progress you have made in any branch of study, how you relish it, what difficulties you find in it; for what you do most taste, or what employments you dislike. I cannot promise you any advice will always be what is at the moment the most valuable, *nil sine magno vita labore dedit mortalibus*: if you wish to get at the nut you must crack the shell; but having trodden the same ground not long before you I can promise that the roads I show you will be the best.

[Here follows a sketch of a course of classical study.]

Collect that] our English holydays are too long to be spent in mere amusement. We should be like the animals who sleep half the year . . .

What is called Divinity, of the contents, historical or doctrinal, of the whole, and of any illustrations of them, Eton boys are generally fully ignorant: with the contents, however, of the historical parts of the O. and N. T., and of the prophecies generally, you, I hope I believe, are acquainted: if, however, you have not read the whole of the O. T. lately, it would be well that you should read them straight through. . . . I should have been glad to have been

able to have pursued the reading of the Articles with you : they are important not only as being Articles of the truth of which you will hereafter have to declare your conviction ; but as containing a clear and concise statement of the doctrines of our religion, so that a Commentary upon them comprises at the same time the explanation and proof of the truths which God has revealed to us. At present Tomline's second volume would be the easiest you could take, and it might be well to read it on the first sixteen Articles, and from the 25th to the 29th or to the 31st (those on the Sacraments).

You must now be nearly or quite tired ; I will therefore only add two pieces of advice on the manner of reading any of your books.

(1) *Whatever you are engaged in, be 'totus in illis,' do it with all your heart and mind :* it will soon add immeasurably to the interest and, could there be degrees of what is immeasurable, I should say more than immeasurably to the usefulness of your employment. When you but half attend, the things themselves of course make but a slight impression, and you lose all insight into the connexion of what you read, and often but half see even the detached parts ; one strong effort often does more to make your way through a difficulty than a thousand petty ones. . . . When you are tired leave off ; but do not mistake restlessness for fatigue : this habit you must acquire, if you ever hope to be useful, or wish to acquire real knowledge.

(2) *Do not content yourself with half knowledge of what you read.* Nothing is more tempting ; novelty hurries one on to what is beyond ; the exertion necessary to fix what is before us in our mind deters us from pausing on it : one thinks one can fix it at some future time. . . .

This reminds me of what I had nearly forgotten, that I should wish you to learn your Hebrew letters, and if your sister will teach you a little, so much the better. Every clergyman ought to know it [Hebrew] ; it is a disgrace to us that it has been so much neglected : but this neglect, as many others, is now wearing away, and I hope very many of your standing will learn it. You should also begin reading regularly your New Testament in Greek, and it would be well to take a Commentary. . . . You might read a chapter of a Gospel daily ; in reading you should attend to the difference between this and other Greek : a chapter a day is easily read ; it will make the Gospels familiar to you as they ought to be, and you will find no little benefit from the habit.

In conclusion, I need scarcely say that as learning, though indispensable, is yet but a subordinate part of the business of a Christian, should you find yourself in any circumstances where the advice and assistance of one some years further advanced than yourself would be useful to you, all I can do I will at any time most readily and eagerly do for you. Write me then a full account of yourself, and do not be alarmed at the length of this letter ; my future ones shall not be so formidable. I much envied Jelf a letter from his William as full as this. I arrived here on last Tuesday, being detained in Berlin by

an act of civility of the Duchess of Cumberland. I have, however, to-day made an interesting acquaintance, and shall soon know the rest of the Theological Professors here, some of whom are very valuable men. I much wish I could spend some part of my Christmas at Pusey, but cannot. God bless you.

With best duty and love,

Your very affectionate

E. B. P.

But a great sorrow was awaiting both the brothers, and indeed their whole family, in the death of Henry, the youngest of the sons, and a general favourite. His bright manners, now and then varied by a flash of rough temper which served as a foil to them and at once passed off, were very endearing. Had he lived he would, it was thought, have been more like his father than any of his brothers. He had only returned to Eton a few weeks when he caught a chill, which was followed by fever. His parents were at once sent for, but when they reached Eton all was over.

When the sad news reached Pusey, for some days he could make little way even with his work for Professor Freytag: he thought that he might have done more for his brother whom he had lost. He had in fact had other work to do: but it was his way, even in early life, to take shame to himself for neglecting duties which it would have been difficult for him to discharge.

Writing to Bishop Lloyd two months later, Pusey refers to the subject in this sense:—

‘[My brother] was ripening into an advanced boyhood of much promise of heart and mind. . . . With the shock of this sudden void in our family and the sorrow of my parents were united [my] regret, that I had in the last two years contributed next to nothing to his improvement; that his happiness would now have been greater had I better discharged my duties of a brother. It may be that we have not so much influence on the future happiness of others, or its degree, as appears to be entrusted to us, and as it may sometimes be useful to think we have. But this is no source of consolation.’

The sorrow was still fresh when, four months after his brother’s death, he wrote to Newman; his letter shows that

he was already feeling his way towards that privilege of intercession for the departed faithful, which he afterwards showed to have been taught by St. Paul, and which afforded him so much support and consolation in the sorrows of his later life :—

‘It was indeed a mysterious dispensation; and the struggle [to submit to God’s will] brought me very low. They are not separated who are not visibly with us. Dare one pray for them? Will you answer me when I see you? Nothing, I am sure, can be found in Scripture against praying for the dead.’

As early as December 1826, and previous to the shock caused by the death of his brother, Newman had, as has been suggested, taxed Pusey with overworking himself. That this imputation was not unfounded Pusey admits, in guarded language, when writing to Dr. Lloyd in the following February. Since his arrival in Germany his only relaxation from his self-imposed severe rule of work had been during his journeys and the fortnight spent in Berlin on his return from Greifswald. Still he must go on until June, if he was to become a good Arabist. Upon this point Freytag was explicit: and Pusey felt that he must obey. But he adds :—

‘I am annoyed at this long absence from theology, and at this so predominant exertion of memory. And I fear that you have, partly on account of a wish which I expressed, altered the books which you have in these terms read with your theological class. But I have done my utmost and must now, at least for a time, diminish my exertions. I am not unwell, but fatigued, and might soon become [unwell]. Pray do not name this to Bouverie, or so that it should reach my family.’

Dr. Lloyd replies :—

‘MY DEAR PUSEY,

‘Ch. Ch., March 30, 1827.

‘I was very much distressed by the account you gave of yourself in your letter; and though I hope all signs of indisposition have passed away by this time, yet I must really warn you very seriously against over-exertion and confinement. You know me well enough to believe that I would not check you, if I did not think it necessary; but what advantage can it be, either to yourself or the world, that you should kill yourself with study? Besides, I cannot forget that I have a fearful degree of responsibility belonging to myself in this case, as I consider myself to have been, in a great degree, the cause of your German

travels. What will your family think of *me*, if you should kill yourself with studying with your German Professors?

‘So send me word that you are quite recovered, and that you do not propose making yourself ill again, and that you will not work more than half as hard as you have done hitherto.

‘Observe that this is said in all seriousness, and not, as heretofore, half in joke, half in earnest.’

Pusey could not comply with the command to send word that he was quite recovered. He had to admit some two months later that he was in very indifferent health indeed, which he attributed, not very accurately, to the weakness of his constitution. His constitution was, in fact, a very good one, but he was subjecting it to an undue strain. However, he was not without occasional intervals of prudence.

‘Bonn, April 22, 1827.

‘I am now using every precaution to prevent a recurrence of illness; taking daily exercise; reading as much as I can in a cheerful garden; leaving my books as soon as fatigued; varying my Arabic studies, though but in a small proportion, with Hebrew and Syriac; besides having made one or two excursions. It is now more than ever necessary for me to remain till the end of June.’

Pusey’s German friends were not less alive to the real danger of his ruining his health than were his friends in England.

‘You will, I trust, pardon me,’ writes Professor Freytag, ‘when, by right of our friendship, I recommend you not to work immoderately. Zeal for science, and for the well-nigh unattainable objects of science, is apt to tempt us to over-exertion. Thus we ourselves, and science through us, suffer. The mental faculties resemble those of the body in this respect, that while moderate exertion strengthens, excessive exertion weakens and cripples them. And, my dear friend, while devoting yourself to sciences, do not forget the great world of men. Each exists for the sake of the other, and they should not be dissociated.’

While Pusey was reading at Bonn, Dr. Legge, the Bishop of Oxford, died, and the see was offered to Dr. Lloyd. He was consecrated at Lambeth on the 4th of March, 1827, by Archbishop Manners-Sutton, assisted by the Bishops of London, Durham, and Chester. He retained his Professorship; an arrangement which, if possible then, would

certainly have been impossible when the diocese had been enlarged by the addition of Buckinghamshire and Berkshire. Oxford men generally, and Pusey in particular, were delighted at the appointment. A report that it had been made found its way to Bonn; and this report was followed by a letter from Dr. Lloyd announcing it to his friend and pupil. Pusey replied, in terms of hearty, but somewhat conventional congratulation, natural to him at the time, but which would not have been employed ten years later, when his sense of what was involved in high office in the Church had been solemnized and deepened.

Pusey's sojourn in Germany was now over; it had done him two great services. It had made him a Semitic scholar, and it had largely familiarized him with the history of modern Protestant speculation on religious subjects. He had been brought into contact with several eminent men, especially of the school of Schleiermacher, whom to know was to admire on the score of high character and great personal accomplishments. They had taught him to feel more than ever the vastness of the world of theological enquiry; and their examples, and to a certain extent their methods, were cherished and followed by him to the last days of his life. They could not give that which they did not themselves possess: it was their business, in the order of Divine Providence, to till and fertilize the soil for its reception.

On the 24th of June Pusey left Bonn for England, returning by way of Rotterdam, and having amongst his luggage little less than a library. He reached his father's house about the middle of July.

CHAPTER VI.

ENGAGEMENT TO MISS BARKER—REVISION OF THE AUTHORIZED VERSION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT—ILLNESS — CORRESPONDENCE WITH MISS BARKER.

1827-1828.

‘And onward still our earnest eyes were bent
To know and see the issue crowning all,—
The unravelling scene of long-drawn wonderment,
Of fights and restless travels long in thrall;—
Unconscious bodings of the soul
Which eagerly thus pored upon the opening scroll.’

WILLIAMS, *Baptistery* (‘The Christian Warrior’).

PUSEY returned from Germany to find that his eldest sister, Miss Elizabeth Bouverie Pusey, had become engaged to the Rev. J. H. M. Luxmoore, a son of the Bishop of St. Asaph, and one of his own contemporaries at Eton. He was delighted, especially on his sister’s account. ‘Daily intercourse,’ he wrote, ‘with one so pious and rightminded as Luxmoore must be a means of improvement to any one.’ The wedding was celebrated at Pusey on October 24, 1827.

This wedding proved to be the herald of another. For nine years Pusey had cherished an affection which seemed likely to bring him only a lifelong disappointment. His own parents and Miss Barker’s were opposed to it: Mr. Raymond Barker had been asked, and had declined, to sanction it. In January 1827, while Pusey was at Bonn, his brother had written him word that the refusal of his own parents to encourage his wishes was not necessarily final. ‘I scarcely read the sentence,’ he afterwards wrote, ‘a second time. I passed it by as opening a painful vision—of bliss which might have been.’ A kind message—probably from Mrs. Barker—which greeted him on his

return from Germany, was equally unheeded. But the death of Mr. Raymond Barker in 1827 had modified the situation; and when it seemed possible that Miss Barker might form another engagement which, in the judgment of those who best knew her, did not seem likely to ensure her happiness, she was led, through the influence of a devoted cousin, to turn her thoughts towards Edward Pusey. They met at Cheltenham, where Mrs. Barker was staying, in the last days of September, 1827. The scene, which was to him as 'the melting of the ice after a Northern winter,' remained to the last fresh in his memory. Not many years before his death his daughter was paying a visit at Fairford Park, and, when taking leave, she asked for some flower which she might take back to her father. Her cousin, Mr. Raymond Barker, gave her a pot of lemon-scented verbena. On seeing it Dr. Pusey burst into tears; 'when I asked your mother to marry me,' he explained, 'I offered her a sprig of verbena, and I always associate it with her.'

The engagement was at first kept almost as a secret. But as the news became known, congratulations from Edward Pusey's friends who had known or guessed the secret of his life came in one by one. Among these a message from Berlin, through Jelf, may be quoted, as illustrating that kindly sympathy with all those whom they ever meet in life, which is an hereditary characteristic of our Royal Family:—

R. W. JELF TO E. B. P.

Berlin, Nov. 1827.

... I am desired by their RR. HH. to offer you their sincerest congratulations, as well as their best thanks for having confided to them so interesting a secret. You have their warmest wishes for your happiness. Prince George, too, was extremely flattered with your confidence in his being old enough to keep a secret; I am glad to say he has that power, and I felt no hesitation in intrusting him with yours, which he heard with the greatest pleasure. He desires me to give his best congratulations to [his] old friend Pusey.

It seemed likely that the wedding would be long delayed. Pusey was dependent on his father for the

means of marrying. Marriage would forfeit his fellowship ; and the handsome allowance which Mr. Pusey still paid regularly to his second son would not enable him to settle comfortably as a married man. Mrs. Barker was naturally anxious that her daughter should be adequately provided for : and Mr. Pusey was still fully occupied with the arrangements for his eldest daughter's wedding. Edward Pusey thought it better not to raise questions which his father might be unwilling to entertain ; and he returned from Pusey to his rooms in Oriel for a period of which he did not clearly foresee any termination.

Almost immediately on his second return from Germany, Pusey had taken in hand a task which, like the projected refutation of Dupuis, illustrates his passion for hard work and the enterprising character of his conceptions. He proposed to himself, alone and unaided, to revise the authorized translation of the Old Testament. His studies in Germany had satisfied him that the English Version was in many respects defective ; and, on his mentioning the project to Bishop Lloyd, he received the warmest encouragement.

'It does seem,' he wrote four months after beginning his task, 'a portentous undertaking. I read the other day that in forming our translation of the Old Testament about twenty persons were employed in three *corps*, for, I believe, nine years. It would be frightful enough ; but that I am standing, as it were, on their shoulders, and with more implements at my command.'

He naturally communicated his plans to Jelf, who discussed them with enthusiasm, not unmingled with some amusement, and common-sense advice :—

R. W. JELF TO E. B. P.

Berlin, Sept. 26, 1827.

What an extraordinary man you are ! That Lloyd should have advised and you should have undertaken a new translation of the Scriptures is nothing wonderful. For I believe that, young as you are, few persons in England are so well qualified for the task as you. But that you should have already accomplished so much is to my slow mind incomprehensible. Your mind is certainly macadamized ; mine resembles the road between this and Strelitz. . . . All I entreat is that however quick in preparing, you will be slow in publishing that which

is of such vital importance. 'Emissum semel volat irrevocabile verbum' is an awful truth when applied to religious works—'Nonnumque prematur in annum.'

Soon after his engagement to Miss Barker, at the end of October, Pusey's health entirely broke down. He was ordered to leave Oxford, and to spend some time at Brighton. He went for a fortnight; but in the event his visit lasted for four months, during which time he was under the medical care of Sir Matthew Tierney. It does not appear that either his engagement or the subsequent collapse of his health had the effect of interrupting for more than a few days the work on which his heart was set.

When he reached Brighton Miss Barker remonstrated with him for not allowing her to share the interests of his occupation. She could not complain of his way of atoning for the omission.

E. B. P. TO MISS BARKER.

Nov. 28, 1827.

My object is, not a new translation, but, retaining the old as far as possible, to correct it, wherever it appears to me to have mistaken the original, or wherever, from alteration of our own language or from inadequate expression in it, it has left the meaning obscure. I purpose not to extend the notes further than the support of my alterations, using for this purpose all the aids which I can find for the better understanding of the Old Testament, and contributing what I can myself from any knowledge of the Eastern languages allied to Hebrew; and it is one motive for wishing to make Oxford our residence that there alone I can have access to books which I do not, or cannot, myself possess, and have intercourse with one or two men whom I can consult when in doubt. There is there also a valuable MS. of an Arabic commentator (i.e. a learned Jew who wrote in Arabic) which I may one day publish, and which I wish to employ. There is another in Syriac, which, on a better acquaintance with the language, I may also use. These never stir out of the walls of the Bodleian. The work goes on now as slowly as you could wish, but I hope effectually, and those who have seen parts of it are sanguine that much good will be done by it. I have at present done little finally: I began it soon after my return from Germany. Job and the Psalms I have corrected in a small Bible, but not having then fully arranged my plan, and so written no notes on these, they must be done over again, and probably not once only. The first nine of the Minor Prophets I have done with some notes and cleared much to myself, but am still doubtful

about several points, particularly in Hosea, and must enlarge the notes. More fully have I gone through the first forty-two chapters (the hardest part) of Isaiah : and here I expect to have little to alter, though probably all my notes will be enlarged on revisal. This looks like Sisyphus' stone or Penelope's web ; but as it is in fact an undertaking on which not my reputation only (about which I should not care) but the great question whether the received version of the Scriptures should not be revised, and be not capable of much additional clearness, will be probably much affected, every step must be taken with the utmost caution. There are many who dread all change, many who idolize our present translation, many who think a new translation will unsettle men's minds, many who in their principles of translation differ from mine ; and I must therefore,—both to secure against these, and actually to avoid unsettling the minds of plain and honest Christians, which might be disturbed by versions unnecessarily conflicting,—do everything in my power to make my corrections as little vulnerable as possible : and having done so honestly, to the best of my power, I shall be unconcerned whatever censures I may meet with, trusting that, upon the whole, I shall have been the instrument of making this portion of God's Word clearer. And though the most blessed work is to apply God's Word to the salvation of others, blessed it still is to be able to render that Word more intelligible for their use ; and with this hope I am satisfied with the plan which I have chosen. Though all consider it incompatible with the active duties of a parish priest, I have mentioned the plan to no one who has not wished me 'God speed,' and expressed joy at the result we hope for. This is my first plan, and I trust that the sacrifice of income which it alone would in the first instance require, and the residence at Oxford, and the occupation of more of my time than might have been required by the mere duties of a parish priest, will not affect your comfort. Other theological plans you shall know hereafter, but I have not now space. Should you even now in reading any Eastern travels, or otherwise, meet with any illustrations of customs, &c., mentioned in the Old Testament, you would render me a service by noting down the book or page where they occur, but I do not wish anything to be read on purpose. Hereafter I shall be exorbitant enough to ask you to undertake no little trouble, in judging what is not sufficiently clear (for to the author himself everything is so), perhaps occasional transcribing, even in aiding to correct the press (which a writer never does so well for himself as another), reading to furnish illustrations (I hardly dare add &c., &c., but I need not say that I will never ask anything which you find irksome). Such are some of the fearful consequences of consenting to share the lot of a student : but portentous as the prospect is, as I dare not contemplate the time when I hope the undertaking will be completed, you need at present be thunderstruck at nothing but my boldness in avowing the labour, to which I have the audacity to ask you to submit.

In January, 1828, he describes his work and intentions at a somewhat more advanced stage :—

‘I have so far changed my plan about my employment that I intend, God willing, to publish, in the first instance, the Psalms, Job, Proverbs [Ecclesiastes], and the Song of Songs, separately. And having therefore finished Isaiah, I have broken off in Jeremiah, finding a more detached employment suits me better, and have begun my notes on the Psalms. These I hope to finish in February. Two months more would finish Job; and then, whenever two months more might come, they would complete so much of the undertaking, and I should be willing to commit my bark to the winds and waves. . . . Of the more difficult books of the Bible, Ezekiel and Zechariah will alone remain untouched.’

He started this new plan with the Book of Job, thinking that his fresh knowledge of Arabic would enable him to decide the question of the age of the book on philological grounds. His corrections, which are numerous and minute, are given in a small Bible, which still exists. Thence he went on to the Psalms, which also are corrected throughout. The corrections of and explanatory notes upon the first nine Minor Prophets, referred to in his letter to Miss Barker, are given in a larger and interleaved Bible; and it also contains his labours on the first fifty-two chapters of Isaiah. This is by far the most elaborate part of the work which remains; and it bears traces here and there of having been retouched at a later date. Besides these are some few corrections of Jeremiah, Ecclesiastes, and the first chapter of the Proverbs, and, finally, the notes upon the Psalms.

But while engaged in these preliminary labours, his thoughts returned to an undertaking he had previously planned of a criticism on Mr. Rose’s book on German Theology. This work he felt to be more urgent, and therefore set himself to write what he hoped would be a short Essay on the Causes of Unbelief in Germany. ‘The Psalms,’ he wrote, ‘are for the time laid aside.’ So far as this effort was concerned they were, as events proved, laid aside for good. His first book on Germany, his ordination, his wedding, and the tour which followed, successively

delayed the resumption of his task, until he found himself, nine months afterwards, nominated to the Hebrew Chair, with many new and exacting duties thrown on his hands, and, above all, that of carrying on Dr. Nicoll's 'Catalogue of Arabic Manuscripts.' This last work was not completed until 1835, and by that time Pusey had learnt sincerely to distrust some of the principles which he had taken for granted when he began his revised and annotated translation. Of these principles,—besides too easy a deference to the authority of modern expositors,—the most important was concerned with the value of the cognate dialects as aids to the interpretation of the Hebrew Scriptures. In common with older scholars, and it would seem with some more recent critics (who, however, apparently consider that they are employing a method previously undiscovered), he had taken it for granted that when the sense of a Hebrew word was obscure or doubtful, it might be explained without difficulty by reference to the use of the corresponding derivative of a common root in some other Semitic language. The insecurity of such a method, as Pusey used to say in later years, might be estimated if the meaning of a modern word in French were to be at once determined by that which it bears in modern Spanish or Italian. Words of common origin have, in fact, widely differing histories: they gather new associations in their different paths; and the importance of the Semitic dialects for Hebrew interpretation, naturally perhaps exaggerated by the great scholars who first studied them thoroughly, has been in later years, at least by the more discriminating students, far more accurately and less highly estimated.

But behind this consideration there was, as time went on, another. The question what the Universal Church might have to say about the meaning of the Book of which it is 'the witness and keeper' would have appeared to Pusey much more pressing and important in 1835 than it did in 1827. However this may be, it is certain that before many years were over he only looked at his early work to feel regret and pain at it. He only did not burn the

volumes which contained it, because they also contained the sacred text, 'disfigured,' as he said, 'by my mistakes.' In the little Bible already referred to we may still read the note in his handwriting:—

'The alterations in this book were made in 1827, and I should not now adhere, perhaps, to most of them. Nov. 1839.'

And in the will which he made on Nov. 19, 1875, he expresses his desire that his executors should not publish 'any of my earlier corrections of the English translation of the Hebrew Scriptures, or notes thereon, seeing that in maturer years I saw reason to withdraw many alterations which I made when young.'

This mature and deliberate expression of his mind will account for the absence of any further history of these, his earliest labours in the field of sacred criticism.

Yet whatever his occupations subsequently, Pusey at this time, as previously and all through his life, was busy with efforts to restore or re-establish those who were in danger of making shipwreck of their faith. For instance, in the autumn of 1827 he was again engaged in a correspondence with a person who had rejected Christianity, but who appears to have been powerfully influenced by him. This description might apply to his fellow-student at Bonn, Herr Boisen; but in that case his influence was chiefly moral and spiritual. In this it was also moral, but mainly intellectual.

'Your account,' writes Jelf, 'of the awakened state of the person who had been an unbeliever is indeed most deeply interesting and spirit-stirring. . . . The desire to believe has been through your means, under God's blessing, awakened. . . . You have been the means of restoring the appetite to a convalescent, if not to a healthy, state, and you must go on to stimulate and to satisfy the cravings of spiritual hunger. One reflection forces itself on my mind. . . . You have once been disappointed in your efforts to reclaim an unbeliever; I know that the disappointment sank deep into your mind. But see the result of the exertions which you then thought useless. . . . You were led to study the evidences . . . and the labour was not lost.'

Referring to this person, Pusey writes, two months later:—

'I have a host of letters to write; among them one long and important one to an improving unbeliever.'

On hearing of his son's engagement to Miss Barker, Mr. Pusey had taken it for granted that the marriage would be delayed for two years. By that time Edward Pusey would have been ordained, and might have been presented to a living, whether by his family, or by Oriel College, or by the Bishop of Oxford. But Pusey, in agreement with Bishop Lloyd's advice, was convinced that it was his duty to remain in Oxford as a student. Consequently the possibility of a speedy marriage seemed very distant.

But relief came from an unexpected quarter. As has been said, Pusey's health had broken down, and he was ordered to Brighton. His father paid him a visit early in December, and Sir Matthew Tierney's report would not have been without its effect. 'My father,' he wrote to Miss Barker on Dec. 3,

'who is now here, induced by my state of health (though not at all alarming), has fully consented to my happiness being completed without waiting for additional professional income, as soon after the restoration of my health as your mother and yourself approve.'

Edward Pusey's bad health did not yield to treatment so soon as was expected. His violent headaches continued at intervals; and the date of his return from Brighton was again and again postponed. In January, 1828, he paid a week's visit to his father's house in Grosvenor Square, but he was again ordered back. At last it seemed that the prospect was improving: he left Brighton on March 18th, and went to London by way of Dover. The wedding was to take place on Thursday, April 17th, in the second week after Easter.

The lengthy correspondence with Miss Barker during their engagement is from many points of view extremely interesting. She became for the time a depository of his theological confidences; and indeed no other source of information exists which tells us so much about his mind as a young man.

Miss Barker, with her mother, had been residing for some time at Cheltenham, where the Rev. F. Close, afterwards Dean of Carlisle, was then beginning to exert considerable

influence as a popular preacher. A leading feature of Mr. Close's teaching was the importance he attached, or was understood to attach, to feeling. Miss Barker appears to have spoken of the subject at some length with Edward Pusey; and his first letter to her enters into the question very fully:—

‘I have taken an opportunity of talking over with my friend Luxmoore, who is a thoroughly practical and excellent Christian, without prejudice, several of the subjects of Mr. Close's sermons, which we together discussed. . . . He thoroughly agrees with me, that the employing the feelings as a criterion of religion is mischievous, because delusive; unduly elating to some, distractingly depressing to others; that a *deep* repentance is perfectly distinct from a *painful* or distressing one; that the only repentance which one has a right to preach or induce others to look for is that which is defined by our Church with a beautiful moderation, “a repentance whereby we forsake sin”; and that whereas some minds are so constituted, or influenced by education, as to have *predominantly* the hatefulness of sin before their eyes, others contemplate principally the mercies of God in His pardon of it, and, filled with heaven-given joy at the glorious prospect of acceptance with God through Christ, though they equally strain to avoid sin, cannot equally dwell upon it, or be equally pained by it.’

Mr. Close's sermons appear to have led Miss Barker to discuss religious difficulties with Edward Pusey in a manner which shows that at an early age she must have thought and read much on such subjects. She was perplexed by apparent contradictions in the Bible. Pusey replied that there were no contradictions in essentials to be found in Scripture; but he thought that some contradictions might exist in Scripture ‘without diminishing from its sacredness, inspiration, authority, or credibility.’

‘They, in fact, amount, if real (and probably in England they would not be *generally* admitted to exist), to slight differences in parts of narrations in the Gospels, which no way affect the truth of the history itself; and in which I suppose (the object of the Holy Spirit being to preserve us such a record as might serve as a foundation for our faith and means of edification, not to inform us of all the incidental minutiae of our Saviour's life, whether e.g. one or two blind men were on a certain occasion cured, whether in going in or out of the city, whether one or two angels were seen at the Holy Sepulchre) the author was left, as we see in matters of style he was left, to himself.’

As to supposed contradictions in respect of matters of

fact in Holy Scripture, Pusey would probably have expressed himself in later years with greater reservations: but he does not allow Miss Barker to forget the value of the practical and devotional study of Scripture.

‘You will find in your daily reading of the Bible, that the use of the marginal references will both facilitate it, and make it more satisfactory. . . . The sole object of Scripture being to provide what is “profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that we may be perfected, thoroughly furnished unto all good works,” all that is necessary (not indeed for a teacher, but for a learner) is willing study with a teachable heart.’

His correspondent had felt the religious perplexity which is occasioned to so many minds by the divided state of Christendom, by the divisions which separate Christian bodies, and even members of the same body from each other. Pusey replies:—

‘The fact is not borne out, that in *essentials* (not what I or Mr. Close might deem essentials, but what Holy Scripture represents as such) there is such disagreement.’

At this time indeed Pusey does not seem to have considered that there was any difficulty whatever in tracing a line round the so-termed ‘essentials’ of Christianity.

Modern differences, again, in faith and opinion suggested those which were supposed to have existed in Apostolic times. Answering a question as to the doctrinal contrast between the Epistles and the Gospels which was then often insisted on, Pusey’s reply showed incidentally how warmly he repudiated the well-known thesis of Lessing that Christ was only the Teacher and not the Object of His religion. Pusey insists that apparent differences are not discordances; that

‘Revelation was, and must be, *progressive*. There were many things, Christ told His disciples, which they *then* could not bear; it was when the Spirit of Truth came that they were to be guided into *all* truth. Christ, as if to show that His teaching was not the main object of His coming into the world,—that He came to be the *Object* of a revelation, not merely to make one,—condescended, as a Teacher, to be Himself only a *preparatory* Instructor. In particular, it seems that everything which related to his own Person and Office could only be obscurely hinted at while He was yet with us; that man could not

have endured to know with full certainty that God was actually visibly present with him ; that the Atonement could not be *entirely* (*partly* it was ; see e.g. John i. 29) preached while the Blood, which was to procure it, was not yet shed ; that faith consequently in that Blood could not in its full extent be insisted upon, or at least not to all (that it was occasionally see e.g. John vi. 51).'

Mr. Close had been preaching against worldly society and its dangers, in the style common among the Evangelicals of fifty years ago. Pusey, in his criticisms, though not exactly expressing his later thoughts, still makes some discriminating observations not unworthy of his maturer moral theology :—

'It seems to me a main and very extensive error in the school to which he belongs, to forget the extent of the natural varieties of conformation of the human mind, and to suppose that the object of Christianity is rather to produce one *uniform* result, than to modify, chasten, exalt, sanctify, the peculiar character of each. Though I should agree with them, that few things were to *any individual* indifferent, yet I must think that there is a large class of actions which are indifferent to any but particular individuals—I mean, whose noxious character, if they have any, depends entirely on the moral constitution with which they meet. In the moral as well as natural frame, what is healthful and nutritious to one person may be deadly poison to another : one e.g. society may only unbend, soften, humanize, and fit better for the discharge of his other duties ; another it may enervate, dissipate, distract ;—one the absence of society may tend to render morose and discontented ; another, "never less alone than when alone," it may lead up to the unseen Being Who is ever around our paths. Or, in things of a more decided character, the love of a child may render one parent only more grateful to God, more anxious for his own spiritual improvement ; another it may make worldly, and alienate him from God : or, in our former illustration, one may be calculated actively to improve society by his intercourse with it ; another may be never seen to less advantage than in it. Now the obvious rule in these cases seems to be to avoid what injures, and select what advances one's own mind ; or, according to the analogy of St. Paul's rule, "Let every one be fully persuaded in his own mind. He that observeth the day, observeth it to the Lord ; and he that observeth not the day, to the Lord he observeth it not. He that eateth, eateth to the Lord, for he giveth God thanks ; and he that eateth not, to the Lord he eateth not, and giveth God thanks." (Rom. xiv. 5.) The chapter is full of good social principles. But men, instead of stopping here, forgetting that what is useful or injurious to themselves may not be so to others, censure others for not adopting

the line which has been useful to themselves, and think that because they could not do with impunity what others are doing, neither therefore could these.'

A complaint as to the style of St. Paul,—his broken or involved constructions,—drew from Pusey some sentences of great beauty and point, which are, it may be thought, sometimes applicable to his own style also :—

'You may perhaps have observed that it is the very fervour of St. Paul's mind, boiling over with the deep feeling of his subject, which produces these involved sentences. His mind is like an excited ocean, in which wave succeeds and towers over wave, in increasing weight and majesty. It must be the case in all writers of great energy, when full of their subject, that they cannot be content with the mere simple statement, but add continually fresh ideas which express some part of the fullness of their conception.'

Mr. Close had preached on the fewness of the saved, and on the reprobation of the Jews. As to the former question, Pusey calls attention to 'the great multitude, whom no man could number, of all nations, and kindreds, and people, and tongues' (Rev. vii. 9). Upon the Jews he observes :—

'We know far too little of the human heart to tell how far their blindness is now wilful or no. What they have themselves suffered, and the contempt and mockery which they still undergo from the Gentile Christians, is no very inviting preparation to acknowledge as the Saviour, Who should restore them, Him in Whose name they have been persecuted. They are educated *in and to* unbelief; and absurd as the expedients seem to us by which they rid themselves of their prophecies,—the double Messiah, the suffering and the victorious, the Son of Ephraim and the Son of Judah, or that God delayed for their wickedness the appearance of the Messiah, Who now lies hid, it is known not where,—absurd as these and a thousand other Talmudical phantasies appear to us, it is absolutely impossible to know how far a Jew, on whose mind they have been early and sedulously impressed, may *honestly* believe them. I feel confident that very many do: and the state of Christianity among us does not yet sufficiently correspond to the magnificent and holy ideal of the Prophets to give its full force to that most convincing evidence of their prophecies. Not that I think we should be slothful about their conversion—in Germany the blessed work has been richly prospered; but in the meantime they seem to me in the same light as the heathen, and that they will be tried by the degree of the spirituality to which under their dispensation

they could attain, not by their acknowledging or non-acknowledging of Christianity.'

As to that practical personal question which at times weighs with all of us, and which Miss Barker raised in her early letters, 'Shall I be saved?' he writes in a letter interesting in itself, and also because of the reference to 'The Christian Year,' which had just made its appearance, and which he refers to as Keble's 'hymns.' 'The hymns,' he says, 'were published solely at his father's wish, to see them before his death. There is so much of Keble's own character impressed upon them that he published them very unwillingly, in filial compliance. He considers, I believe, much in them as an otherwise unjustifiable disclosure of what should remain known only to his God.' Pusey quotes 'The Christian Year' as if it were already a classic.

'Is it expedient for us that we should *know* that we shall be saved? What difference would it make in our conduct, in our exertions? Here also I think that, *Prudens* (in his wisdom) *futuri temporis exitum caliginosâ nocte premit Deus*; the knowledge might add to our ease, but might it not diminish our endeavours after holiness? Is it that God has not given us light enough, or that we are anxious for a flood of it, which mortal eyes might not endure? . . . But you wrote this part of your letter before you read Keble's beautiful hymn; and I think you would now be more inclined to acquiesce in those excellent lines:—

"But He would have us linger still
Upon the verge of good or ill,
That on His guiding Hand unseen
Our undivided hearts may lean,
And this our *frail and foundering* bark
Glide in the narrow wake of His beloved Ark¹."

But the question recurs at a later date, and his answer is more decided, and in accordance with the spirit of his later treatise 'What is of faith as to Eternal Punishment?'

'There is no human being on whose future misery I would venture to decide, because there is no human being the strength of whose difficulties, whose proportional employment of the various means of

¹ 'The Christian Year,' Sixth Sunday after Epiphany, stanza 2.

improvement given him, whose entire state of heart, I know. As a preacher, as an expounder of Scripture, I would hold out no hope where Scripture does not give *positive* grounds for it: the hope would be used only by the careless, and by them abused; but, as a man, I may hope that there are means for the extension of mercy to thousands, whose case, to our limited view, would seem desperate.'

During the whole of his visit to Brighton he was a solitary invalid, under the care of Sir Matthew Tierney, and at times he had to lay aside the occupations which relieved his loneliness. He used to work with his head swathed in damp handkerchiefs; or he sought more complete relief by leeches, or, as at Bonn, by cupping. At last his headaches were too painful to be endured: he could work no more. His own experience suggested the advice which he wrote to Miss Barker for the benefit of an invalid sister:—

'Sickness has its duties as well as health, and often the more important ones: our passive duties are often more important, in their performance, to others; often, if not even generally, more influential in forming our own character than our active ones. . . . Want of occupation is one misery of ill-health; but the occupation of watching and correcting and improving our own hearts for the love of our Saviour, and in order not to bring discredit on His promises, or cause them to be undervalued, is one which will give an interest to seasons of pain which equals any of the active duties of health in the most active existence. If one compares one's own petty sufferings with His sufferings, one feels ready to sink with shame into the earth for having given them a moment's thought. The fifty-third chapter of Isaiah or the history of the Crucifixion is an antidote to the bitterness of any sorrow.'

Another letter shows that Pusey's feelings about society, which after 1839 led him to withdraw from it entirely for the rest of his life, were already shaping themselves.

'In Brighton,' he says, 'the tumult of fashion and gaiety, if such there be here, does not reach me: it is, as I said, as illegal here to extend the promenade to my abode, though on the edge of it, as in Cheltenham beyond the turnpikes; and though I have walked on the shingles below the Cliff (where each step in advance is accompanied by one in retreat) to avoid the spleen as well as to enjoy the roar of Ocean as he lashes the shore, I can generally preserve my composure. The feeling, however, is rather a mournful one, to see so many

human beings apparently wasting their existence and forgetting its object.'

The same feeling was roused more powerfully by London; and the passage which expresses it anticipates many a conversation, and some of his sermons:—

'It has long been to me a source of melancholy to see under any circumstances a crowded population, more especially where every countenance seems to express intentness on its own earthly object. . . . It is a morbid feeling, but it makes London, notwithstanding that it contains the mainsprings of religious activity as well as of all that is wretched and sinful, often appear to me like a great lazaret-house, which I would willingly visit as a physician, but not as a spectator, much less as a patient.'

Pusey's correspondence with Miss Barker at this period illustrates what he afterwards felt to be a certain immaturity of mind on subjects, some of which it fell to his lot to press with so much weight and learning on the conscience of the Church of England. He would say of these early days: 'we had no sufficient information, and we were feeling our way.' It will be remembered that he was not yet even a deacon.

Writing about the succession of fast and festival, 'our ancestors were,' he said, 'right in preparing for Easter, as they did, by humiliation and earnest thought. The bright prospect to which the Christian world is elevated by the recurrence of Easter Day was the more exalted and exalting from the previous passage through the gloomy valley of self-abasement.' Lent naturally suggested fasting; and his correspondent was too practical not to wish for definite ideas on the subject. Pusey had written to Miss Barker, deprecating austerities, in the commonplace generalities of the day; and she wanted something precise and definite that might help her. Pusey was not yet quite equal to the occasion. But he said what he could:—

'My opinions upon fasting not being the result of reading, I can name no book which would support my views, simply because I have read none: I can, however, say that two excellent clergymen, Hawkins and Newman (both of whom, I trust, you will hereafter know, who

would not abate one tittle of Christian strictness, and both indeed themselves abstemious), do not go in the least beyond me.'

Miss Barker consulted him on questions of Church history. One long letter to her is a condensed account of the controversies which led to the suppression of Port Royal. Another turned on a question which she had asked him as to what she was to think of her namesake, St. Catharine of Siena. His answer savoured somewhat of the shallow 'common-sense' of the eighteenth century, the traditional language of which he had not yet revised, and was unconsciously repeating. Thirty years later he would have judged it severely.

'Your namesake about whose vision you enquire was probably a half-distracted, visionary, and vision-seeing mystic. How far knavery may have mingled with her fanaticism, or whether she was only employed as an instrument by others, can probably not be decided. She certainly was employed both for political and religious objects both in the schism of the Popes and the contest between the Franciscans and Dominicans about the superhuman birth of the Virgin Mary, in which she was the organ of a revelation in favour of the Dominican. . . . *The* vision (for she persuaded herself, it is to be hoped, that she was continually blessed with them) was the betrothing to our Saviour, which she had earnestly requested as a seal that she should never cease to be devoted to Him. She describes her betrothing, and that after the train had vanished, the ring (a costly one) remained on her finger.'

Answering a question as to the possible results of popular education, Pusey already displays the caution which, throughout his life, marked his attitude towards strong enthusiasms when diverted from religious principle.

'I wish I could share in Dr. S.'s exultation at the intellectual improvement of the lower classes. I fear that it is very disproportionate to their moral and religious advance; that it is much more likely to make them real or practical infidels, as before the distress of the manufacturing districts the prevailing feeling was not merely being indifferent to, but above all religion. And this is one of the phenomena which makes me fear most for our country; and I fear a crisis is approaching (whether it come in the next decade of years or no) in which Christianity will have to struggle for its existence. God's will be done.'

Pusey's letters illustrate also not unfrequently his ardent

political sympathies in early life. The unbending Toryism of their father may have had something to do with driving both Mr. Pusey's sons into the ranks of Liberalism. Political questions were kept much before men's minds in 1827 and 1828 by the frequent changes in the Ministry, and a widespread unsettlement in the country. The question of Roman Catholic Emancipation had been an open one in the Cabinet since 1812. The subject was frequently debated in Parliament; Pusey was a most warm supporter of the proposal. Although no measure was before the country in October 1827, Pusey wrote to Miss Barker in the subjoined terms:—

‘If I wished to gain a clear view of the Emancipation question I should not allow my mind to dwell on the *abstract* objection, “that a R. C. must *necessarily* be a bad legislator for a Protestant country,” or let my mind roll from a *vague* contemplation of the one set of arguments to the other; but setting out on the side on which the *general* truth lay, i.e. that unless there were any special objection, none should be stigmatized for their religious opinions as unfit to be members of a Legislature, or be excluded from it, first consider all the arguments on this side, and then weigh what might be said against it. It might be that, after all, there might be some which I could not remove; but had I thus acquired a strong conviction that the demand should be granted, these objections would induce me to make allowance for those of opposite opinions, but not change or in the least affect the certainty of my convictions.’

The Emancipation question led him to state his ideas at that time on the subject of Roman Catholicism:—

‘The Roman Catholics, though they have mingled up superstitions with and adulterated the Faith, have yet retained the foundations. I do not mean to deny the practical idolatry into which they have fallen, or that the “good works” of self-emaciation, hairshirts, flagellations, &c., have not had a merit ascribed to them which interfered with the merits of Christ: yet still, whatever they may have added, they did hold that acceptance was through Christ; and as to the mediation of the saints, it was, in *theory*, only the same as one asking a good man to pray for us. The danger was that it might be *practically* more, yet so as rather to lead to *idolatry*, than to an interference with the Atonement. Yet I as well as you doubt not that there have been hundreds of thousands of sincere men among the Roman Catholics, and that every sincere man has been led into that degree of truth which was necessary to salvation; and that there are

many . . . at whose feet it would be happiness to think that we might sit in the kingdom of heaven. There may be much love where there is little knowledge, and *vice versâ*.'

Similarly Pusey greatly rejoiced over the result of the battle of Navarino, and the immediate prospects of Greek independence.

In the early spring of 1828 Parliament was discussing Lord J. Russell's motion for the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts. As Miss Barker was in Portman Square she had many opportunities of learning what was going on. 'I do envy you,' Pusey writes from Brighton, 'the earlier knowledge how Lord John Russell's motion against these disgraceful laws, the Test and Corporation Acts, succeeds. According to the paper, it is for next Saturday: so that you may know it two days before me.' Four days afterwards he resumes :—

'I am very anxious about the Test and Corporation Acts. I think them both in their means and end a disgrace and deterrent to religion. They, more than anything else, keep alive the bitterness of party spirit among Christians, agreeing in the same essentials of faith, in England.'

And again, a week later, he expresses his 'extreme joy at the tidings which I heard yesterday of the triumphant majority of 44 against those Ministers, which assures, at least, a modification of this disgraceful and injurious system. Lord John Russell's speech, though not very brilliant, was solid, as his always are. His quotations from bishops of earlier days were very good, particularly Bishop K[en]. There was less timidity then than now. I was glad, too, to see Peel so moderate, and peculiarly glad that our "learned" body had not meddled. That vote, I hope, will be a new era for us, and that we as well as our ancestors shall trust more in the goodness of our cause than in the might of legislation.'

Once more, on March 5 :—

'It rejoices me to hear that the Test Act Repeal will probably be victorious in the House of Lords. . . . I should be perplexed to see any of the bishops voting for the continuance of the profanation.'

His Liberalism was however always strictly bounded by respect for monarchical institutions—a respect which was

by no means a matter of course among Liberals in the days of George IV.

‘A Republic is perhaps the very best Utopian government, and were I to make a constitution for that happy country it might perhaps be Republican; but unfortunately, constituted as men are, it is fit for no place beside, any more than to have no government at all. Bishop Wilson’s maxim, though ill-timed, was very right (when asked by the late King whether he were not a Republican—you probably know it): 100 tyrants were 100 times as bad as one. The history of Greece convinced me that a Republic was the worst despotism except an Aristocracy, i.e. Oligarchy (and if so in Greece, much more so, you will allow, anywhere else); and the best politicians among the ancients agreed in thinking the most perfect government that which we have, a balance of the three powers. Poor Poland, with one of the finest people in the world, is an eternal warning against elective monarchies. There is no doubt but that, though our constitution might be improved in minor points, something of its kind will be the constitution of the civilized world.’

CHAPTER VII.

THE PROVOSTSHIP OF ORIEL — DEATH OF MR. PUSEY —
ORDINATION — MARRIAGE — FIRST SERMON.

1828.

‘But Thou, dear Lord,
Whilst I traced out bright scenes which were to come,—
Isaac’s pure blessings, and a verdant home,—
Didst spare me.’

Lyra Apostolica, xxix.

DURING his stay at Brighton in the early months of 1828 an event occurred of great practical interest to Pusey, and, as events have shown, of even momentous importance to the Church. A vacancy in the see of Llandaff was filled by the appointment of the Provost of Oriel, Dr. Copleston. If the Welsh see was the more dignified, the Provostship of Oriel was to be, in the ensuing years, the more important position; but this would not have been obvious at the time either to the departing Provost or to the electors of his successor. For some weeks, however, the impending election occupied the minds of the Fellows as an event of at any rate the highest domestic importance; and Pusey was at heart as much interested as anybody else.

Three candidates were in the field; their names stood in the subjoined order as fifth, sixth, and seventh Fellows:—Rev. John Keble, Rev. J. E. Tyler, and Rev. Edward Hawkins. From the first the issue really lay between Keble and Hawkins. It appears in a letter from Keble to Hawkins, that when the vacancy first occurred Keble could not make up his mind. It is certain that ‘if there had been anything like an unanimous call of the Fellows’ he would have undertaken the duties of the office. But he

thought that he was 'very likely to be left in a minority,' and being indifferent to prominence of any kind, he appears to have written that 'a Headship at Oxford, though no doubt a comfortable respectable concern, would by no means realize my *beau idéal* of life.' That something like 'an unanimous call,' which as the voice of duty might have overcome this hesitation, was not addressed to him, was a result to which, in after years, Pusey sadly felt that he had contributed. On December 28th Keble wrote a playful and characteristic letter to Hawkins, to announce that he was no longer a candidate for the vacant Provostship. He did not shrink from its duties; he did not think it a much more difficult trust than any other pastoral employment; he had no wish to be supposed to be 'eaten up with a morbid distrust of himself.' But private and family reasons led him not to wish for it; and there was no reason, when his correspondent was a candidate, for troubling the College with any difference of opinion in the matter. The result was that on February 2nd, 1828, Hawkins was unanimously elected Provost of Oriel.

This situation is so historical, and so much has been written about it, that it may here suffice to describe Pusey's exact share in what took place. He made up his mind, early in the day, that Hawkins would make the best Provost. His reasons are given in the subjoined letter to one whose equitable care had secured his own election as Fellow in 1823.

E. B. P. TO REV. H. JENKYNs.

5 Eastern Terrace, Brighton, Dec. 11, 1827.

... Without further preface, then, ever since I have well known the three individuals from whom our future Provost is likely to be selected, T., H., and K., I have been very anxious that H. should be the person who should fill the office. This is not a question of the comparative merits of the individuals *in themselves*, but with relation to an office of a peculiar character, and requiring peculiar habits and talents for its right discharge. Were personal excellence, high talents, a pure and beautiful mind, alone necessary, H. himself would not compete with K.; yet requiring as it does a great knowledge of human nature, and a general practical turn of mind, I cannot but think that K. is most deficient in the very points which are here perhaps of primary

importance, and that in these same points H. peculiarly excels. The very facility of K.'s mind, removed as he has been from the opportunity of acquiring an enlarged experience of the minds of others, and especially of those of the common age of undergraduates, seems to diminish his fitness for the office: viewing their minds in the almost speckless mirror of his own, he not unfrequently seems to propose measures, whether of improvement or discipline, the very last which are likely to have effect upon minds of an ordinary, or of no extraordinary, stamp. Even too, from K.'s general character, we should have to anticipate too little of system in the manner to be pursued. H., on the contrary, joins with a very rare acuteness an uncommonly practical character, and has by his long service in the tuition very materially improved his naturally quick perception of character; and I know no one who either selects these points so acutely, or is more successful, by a constant reference to right principle, in improving them. I can myself acknowledge with gratitude that there is no individual with whom I have been permitted to hold intimate intercourse from whom I have derived so much benefit. I may just add, that an apparent austerity, which formerly created some prejudice against him, has partly worn away, partly been subdued, and that now he is the object of personal regard as well as of respect. As a member of the board of Heads of Houses, and as we are also electing, I can conceive no one whose practical, moderate, and unbiased views, yet not slavishly adhering to everything customary, would, as far as a single opinion and voice have influence, be more serviceable to the University. Though less directly, we may take into consideration the benefit likely to accrue to the Church, by reserving leisure for one who has a decided taste for theological enquiry, whose enquiries are characterized by the same comprehensiveness, acuteness, steadiness, and practical purpose, and likely to involve of extensive ability. I believe I need hardly say that in these statements I have every reason to believe myself free from personal bias: I am (as every one must be who is acquainted with him) extremely attached to K.; my attachment to him commenced and has much increased by circumstances which I cannot now explain: from the time that I first formed these views, though H. had my personal esteem and respect, I individually unquestionably had more regard for K. At the time when the decision became necessary I felt (and I am now decidedly better) my health so precarious that I was not likely, then at least, to be swayed by anything but principle. I have said nothing, because I believe that with regard to him the question is already decided, as the seven votes which I know (and which are already a majority) are divided indeed between H. and K., but both to T. . . .

I may add that I suspect that the other residents entertain the same opinion of the relative fitness of H. and K.: D. and N. unquestionably do, though W. and Fr. would give their first vote to K., I suspect it to be from personal attachment, and, what perhaps is more to the purpose,

I understand that such of our former Fellows as are likely to be best acquainted with the matter take the same view.

. . . I have been obliged to remove to this place for health, but am getting better, and should at all events be at the election.

Believe me, my dear Jenkyns,

Yours most sincerely,

E. B. PUSEY.

This was followed by a letter to the person principally concerned.

E. B. P. TO REV. J. KEBLE, JUNR.

5 Eastern Terrace, Brighton, Dec. 14, 1827.

A feeling of (perhaps false) shame has prevented me hitherto from writing to you. Yet it did seem an uncalled-for, if not presumptuous, undertaking, to tell you that for the office about to be vacated I did prefer one other to yourself. Yet finding that, at least in Hawkins' case, the same has been done and kindly taken, I have resolved upon the unwelcome task for fear of a worse evil—of having my views mistaken. It is, however, still with reluctance that I say anything. And I believe it were best to confine myself to the simple and sincere assurance that though I have thought it my duty to decide in this instance to vote for Hawkins, and to explain to some others the grounds of that vote, should the choice of the majority finally fall upon you I should anticipate from your promotion high and extensive benefits to our College. I think, indeed, in common with all, that we are singularly fortunate in having two such individuals from whom to select our Head. Were Hawkins not your competitor I should have voted, without any mixture of pain, for you against any third person, which I cannot now, for Hawkins against you. It is difficult on this subject not to appear to say too much or too little. I will therefore only add that it is not upon any comparison of the individuals in themselves, but in relation to a peculiar office, that I have formed my decision. You will not, on account of that decision, I am sure, think that I am less sincerely

Your affectionate and obliged

E. B. PUSEY¹.

On January 3 Edward Pusey writes to Miss Barker:—

'This morning has brought me intelligence that would (dare I be selfish) be disappointing. There is to be no election at Oriel, Keble having withdrawn, partly as thinking Hawkins a fitter man, partly from domestic circumstances at Fairford. Any difference of opinion which there might have been is now over. There is no third to

¹ Pusey's reply to Keble's 'kind answer' to this letter is given in Newman's 'Letters and Correspondence,'

i. p. 175 note. The 'kind answer' has been lost.

compete with Hawkins, and therefore the election, being only nominal, will not require the presence of the Fellows.'

Never in the later years of his life did Dr. Pusey refer to the decision which he took on this occasion without adding a word of self-reproach on the score of what he afterwards considered his failure to read the true significance of character. Of this feeling the most deliberate expression occurs in the sermon which he preached at the opening of Keble College Chapel on St. Mark's Day, 1876. After referring to Mr. Keble's willingness, 'had minds been one,' to accept the Provostship, and to his saying 'I should not have shrunk from it as from a Bishopric,' Dr. Pusey adds:—

'Unhappily, some of us who loved him did not know the power of his deep sympathy with the young heart, and thought another more practical. He could not bear division, so withdrew. The whole of the later history of our Church might have been changed had we been wiser: but God, through our ignorance, withdrew him, and it must have been well with him, since God so overruled it. To us it became a sorrow of our lives¹.'

His self-reproach on this head was not shared, at least by all his colleagues. 'I recollect,' wrote Cardinal Newman to Pusey in 1882, 'making Jenkyns laugh by saying in defence of my vote, "You know we are not electing an angel but a Provost. If we were electing an angel, I should of course vote for Keble; but the case is different." I voted, however,' he adds, 'for Hawkins, from my great affection for and admiration of him. I have never ceased to love him to this day. I certainly was sorry I had helped to elect Hawkins; but I can't say I ever wished the election undone. Without it there would have been no Movement, no Tracts, no Library of the Fathers.'

Pusey's connexion with Oriel was soon to be terminated by his marriage, which was fixed for April 17. But he had

¹ 'Blessed are the Meek:' a sermon. Parker, Oxford, 1876, p. 24. Mr. T. Mozley ('Reminiscences,' vol. i. p. 39) says that 'Newman was much surprised and concerned' when he read this statement. In a letter to Dr. Pusey, dated Birmingham,

August 4, 1882, Cardinal Newman says, 'I never expressed, I never felt, any surprise whatever, any concern whatever, at your words about me, including me with yourself in what you said about Hawkins's election.'

one more duty to discharge towards the College. The last examination for Fellowships in which he took part ended on Friday, April 11th. He had expressed to Newman his dissatisfaction at the accounts which he had received of the intellectual qualities of the candidates. But there was, as the event proved, no reason for his anxiety in this regard. The result of the examination added to the Fellows' list George Anthony Denison, afterward Archdeacon of Taunton, one of the most accomplished Latinists and most vigorous champions of Church principles that Oxford has ever produced; Charles Neate, the friend of Sainte Beuve, who many years after represented the city of Oxford in Parliament; and Walter John Trower, who, as Bishop of Glasgow, lived to be in opposition to Pusey on questions which were then very remote from the minds of men. Writing to Miss Barker, Pusey describes the general result of this election as 'advancing liberal principles.'

The Oriel election being over, Pusey hastened back to town. He reached his father's house late on the evening of the day of the election—Friday, April 11th. It was now less than a week to the day fixed for his wedding. On Low Sunday, April 13th, there was a family dinner in Grosvenor Square. All Mr. Pusey's children were present, excepting Mrs. Luxmoore. Contrary to his usual habit, which was undemonstrative and taciturn, Mr. Pusey made a little speech in view of the approaching wedding. He had been ill in the winter, but his health was now, as it seemed, completely restored.

'Things,' he said, 'had lately gone very well with him; and he had much to be thankful for. Philip was very happily married; Edward was happily engaged; and he himself could wish for nothing more in this world.'

During the night that followed he died very unexpectedly from a sudden failure of the heart's action. Lady Lucy was with him; and there was just time to call her son Edward, but no other member of the family was present.

The body was taken to Pusey on Friday, the 18th, and was buried in the family vault on the following Sunday.

The eldest son went to the funeral, but Edward remained with his mother in London. He could not share 'this first sorrow,' as he called it, even with Miss Barker—at least, not at once. 'In a few days,'—so he wrote on the morning after his bereavement,—

'I trust I shall be able to think of my loved father principally, in a few more perhaps solely, as he now is—a pure, and holy, and happy spirit in the presence of his God and his Redeemer, admitted to a portion of that happiness which commenced in his holy life even here. . . .

' . . . Do not think of me as bowed down by my loss. Sudden as it is, and painful the contrast with my late exultation in his apparently restored health, yet we have every source of comfort ; though one must wish to have had a few last words, which one might have treasured, from him. . . . He died, if one may dare so to say, just as he should have died. . . . Excuse these broken lines. I shall soon be happy again in his happiness.'

Each day in that week he wrote to Miss Barker. The language of sorrow is only not monotonous when it is perfectly unstudied. He is chiefly concerned about his mother. There is little about himself. Only on the 17th,—the day which had been fixed for their wedding,—does he refer to its postponement.

'Since it has been thus ordered, it is best for me. . . . I may mourn that the person whose lot you have consented to share is such as to require so heavy a trial, yet it will, I trust, make him more worthy of you.'

The next day he writes :—

'I feel my father nearer to me now that the earthly remains are gone to their last resting-place than when they were here. Now, whenever one thinks (and in these days, at least, one must very often think) of his and our God and Father and Saviour, one seems again united with him. All the dreary past seems a dream. . . . Could but faith entirely prevail over sight and memory, one would be quite happy, even now.'

Pusey's Ordination had been again and again postponed. In 1823 it was delayed by the consequence of his election at Oriel; in 1824 by his absorbing controversy with his unbelieving schoolfellow; in 1825 by the philological

studies connected with his visit to Germany. In 1826 he was abroad, and in 1827 he was an invalid at Brighton. Now, however, it seemed that the purpose of his life might at last be realized : yet he still felt that he could not undertake the direct cure of souls. He would work for souls, but indirectly, by removing, through literary labour, difficulties in the way of faith : this would satisfy his Ordination vow and enable him to engage in the occupations for which he believed that God had designed him. When in Germany even he wrote to Newman, 'The cure of souls I dare not undertake.' Moreover, he shrank from being 'paid' for such work. He looked upon his ordination at this date mainly as furnishing a consecration of learning, by keeping before him the one sacred object which secures for learning its true dignity. Yet he was not without other thoughts.

'I at times look with regret at the active professional labours, the direct winning souls to Christ, which is the crown of all theology, and which I have for the time abandoned.'

He remained with his mother in London until the beginning of May. Then he returned to Oxford¹ and read for his Ordination. With the change of scene and resumption of work his spirits revived. He walked out daily, generally on Foxcombe Hill : he had, as he wrote, recovered his elasticity, and could appreciate the beauty of the scene and the blue hyacinths in the copse between Foxcombe and Cumnor.

His days were now spent in the study of theology. St. John's Gospel he found 'permanently tranquillizing to his mind' after his recent sorrow. The standard of knowledge required of candidates for Ordination seventy years ago was not a high one, even in the diocese of Oxford. Pusey almost thought that he need not have read for it. 'It was over,' he tells Miss Barker, 'on Wednesday, and turned out to be one which I could have answered as well eight years ago.' He was ordained deacon at Christ

¹ 'Poor Pusey came here last Monday. He is much thrown back and his spirits very low. . . . He,

Pusey, is going to change his name to Bouverie : this however is quite a secret.' Newman's 'Letters,' i. p. 184.

Church on Trinity Sunday, June 1, 1828, by Bishop Lloyd. Two days afterwards he describes his impressions:—

‘Sunday was a very solemn day. It would have been so anywhere. But the ordination taking place in the part of the Cathedral which I used to frequent for four years, and in which I had not now been for five, brought a tide of recollections of former life—a strong comparison of myself with my former self. Yet it had been in itself one of the most solemn days of life. However one had before purposed to devote one’s best powers to the glory of God and the good of “the Church which Christ purchased with His own Blood,” one had not, by any open act, pledged oneself to it. One seemed more a free agent, a volunteer who had still liberty (though there was no possibility of the wish) to employ himself in any other way.

‘It is now otherwise. If I do not now dedicate all my strength to it, if I do not exert every power to purify my heart and improve my mind, as may most tend to advance His kingdom, I shall have broken my faith solemnly pledged—be a deserter, a renegade, a worse than slothful servant. I cannot now in anything offend without producing a proportionate offence in others. If the ministers of the Church, which still ought to be the salt of the earth, lack saltiness, there is no external means by which they can recover it. They are fit only to be cast out. Yet these thoughts, though solemn, are not depressing. With every fresh responsibility fresh strength is given.’

On the day of his Ordination, he said the evening service in the parish church of St. Mary the Virgin, which since the preceding February had been held by his friend Newman¹. On the following Sunday he assisted Mr. Newman at the altar by administering the chalice. On the preceding day he had written to Miss Barker:—

‘I am in a few hours going to assist for the first time in administering the Communion. . . . The person whom I am going to assist is a very valued and dear friend, with whom I should most wish to be joined in this holy office.’

At length the many anxious years of waiting were at an end, and Edward Pusey was married to Miss Barker at St. Mary’s, Bryanstone Square, by his friend R. W. Jelf, on June 12th. The wedding tour lasted three months. They visited Derbyshire and then passed to the Lake

¹ ‘June 1st. Pusey ordained. [He read prayers for me in the evening at St. Mary’s, and reminded me years afterwards that I said to him “If you

read from your chest in that way, it will kill you.”]’ Newman’s ‘Letters,’ i. p. 186.

district, calling on Mrs. Southey and Mrs. Coleridge. They explored a large portion of the Western Highlands and some of the Hebrides. On their return journey, after a narrow escape from being drowned in the Tweed, they spent two days with Sir Walter Scott at Abbotsford; and a day or two more at Rokeby Castle, the home of Miss Morritt, to whom Pusey had been introduced at Brighton as 'Walter Scott's Minna.'

On September 4th they reached Badger Hall, Shropshire. Badger Church is memorable as the building in which on September 7th, 1828, Pusey preached his first sermon. His text was Heb. xii. 14: 'Follow peace with all men, and holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord.' The sermon, after the fashion of those days, was preached again elsewhere: at Cuddesdon at the end of October 1828, and at Tytherly in 1832. It contains many additions in a later handwriting, and many erasures, as though the preacher had endeavoured in after years to adapt it to his later and fuller thoughts, and had at last abandoned the attempt. But it is marked by the characteristics which belonged to his sermons to the last, intensity of moral purpose, reiteration, exhaustiveness, manifest determination to make his hearers understand the importance of the point he was enforcing, and a complete indifference to method and rhetorical effect. It is remarkable that the first of Mr. Newman's published Parochial Sermons is on the same text and subject. The movement in which they both took so leading a part was, before all things, a call to 'holiness.' Of this sermon and visit an interesting account is given by Mrs. Pusey's cousin, Miss Boddington, who was living at Badger Hall:—

'Edward Pusey was extremely kind to me: his affection for his wife is quite unbounded, his amiability and kindness to every one is very pleasing, but not more than might well be expected from one so deeply imbued with the spirit of Christ's religion. He went about with us into all the cottages and shook hands with all the old people, saying as they were acquaintances of Maria's they ought to be of his, and having a word of advice or comfort for every one: he gave wonderful satisfaction to all the neighbourhood, but above all to me, by preaching his first sermon in this church. It was a most truly

excellent and beautiful discourse on the words, "Without holiness no man shall see the Lord." I seldom hear the sermon at all, and if I do, you know how little it is worth hearing; it therefore was a bright spot in a barren waste, and its coming from one in whom from his relation to my very dear friend I was so deeply interested, made it the more impressive. I was quite overcome, but mine were not the only tears shed. Mrs. Dorothea Whitmore came over to hear him, and her expectations were wonderfully surpassed: she said she had nearly been deterred from coming by a showery morning, but could she have foreseen what she was to have heard no weather, however bad, would have made her hesitate. If you like, I can read it to you when we meet, for I took a copy, though it is very true that a sermon *read* is nothing in comparison to a sermon *preached*; the words from the pulpit fall with tenfold weight upon the heart. He is entirely engrossed with the subject of Divinity, and, unless upon that point, is a silent man: he listens and makes great observation on character, and always leans to the most amiable side in his judgement; but he is not by the generality thought agreeable—Tom and Reginald think him very stupid.'

From Badger Hall they journeyed to Oxford, where they arrived on September 12th, 'exactly three calendar months from the day on which we left London.' They were welcomed at the Bishop of Oxford's house in Christ Church Quadrangle for a lengthy visit.

CHAPTER VIII.

CONTROVERSY WITH REV. H. J. ROSE ON THE THEOLOGY OF GERMANY.

1828-1830.

A FEW days before Pusey's ordination as deacon, his book on the 'Theology of Germany' was issued from the press. It was written against one who not many years afterwards worked heartily at his side, and was one of the chief movers in that Church revival so intimately associated with Pusey's name. This was the Rev. Hugh James Rose, of Trinity College, Cambridge, and Vicar of Horsham, in Sussex. As Select Preacher, Mr. Rose had in May, 1825, delivered four discourses at Cambridge on 'The State of Protestantism in Germany.' Mr. Rose's reputation as a scholar and theologian, his clear style, and the deep seriousness of purpose which belonged to his high character, combined to give a greater importance to these discourses than University sermons generally possess. Mr. Rose was, moreover, understood to be in the confidence of some leading prelates; and thus the discourses were informally invested with an air of authority which, apart from their object and contents, commanded wide attention. They were, in fact, listened to with great interest. The Vice-Chancellor and other influential persons at Cambridge begged that they might be published; and in the autumn of 1825 the volume appeared with a dedication to Dr. Blomfield, then Bishop of Chester¹.

¹ 'Discourses on the State of the Protestant Religion in Germany.' Cambridge, Deighton, 1825.

The book was certainly calculated to make an impression on English readers. Except among a small band of divines, little or nothing was known in England about religion in Germany. A Bampton lecturer, Mr. Conybeare, had touched on the subject in one of his eight discourses. Bishop Jebb, of Limerick, had devoted a note in his Primary Charge to its consideration. Dr. Pye Smith, a learned and pious Dissenter, had animadverted on the modern German divines in his 'Scripture Testimony to the Messiah.' Ordinary Englishmen supposed the Protestantism of Germany to have remained stationary in the condition in which Luther had left it; and the Middle Ages themselves were not more a blank to the English mind than the three centuries of German religious history which had passed since the Reformation. The great struggle with Napoleon had brought England into relations of peculiar intimacy with Prussia; and the continent had been open to Englishmen for ten years since the Peace. German politics and German editions of the classics were welcomed in England; but the history, the results, the temper, and the tendencies of German Protestant theology were as little understood as though they had belonged to another and a distant continent, far beyond the pale of Christendom and civilization.

Mr. Rose undertook to lift the veil. According to his representation the Protestant Church of Germany was 'the mere shadow of a name.' It was the scene of 'an abdication of Christianity'; and this 'abdication' was not confined either to the Lutheran or to the Calvinistic sections of that body. A virtual negation of that which had hitherto been understood to be Christianity was taught by divines from the pulpit, and by professors from the chair of theology; and a growing religious indifference in all ranks and degrees of the nation was the natural result. Rose brought forward a mass of evidence to show that by many theologians in Germany the New Testament was held to contain, not eternal truths, but only the opinions of Christ and the Apostles, adapted to the age in which they lived. Christ Himself, it was said, neither intended, nor was able, to teach a system

that would endure ; although incidentally He might teach something enduring. His teaching was said to be addressed to the Jews alone, and to be only a product of Jewish philosophy. He Himself erred ; and His Apostles spread and added to His errors. It was a mistake to accept a doctrine on the authority of Scripture. Reason alone could decide whether a doctrine was Divine. The truths of natural religion were the only substantial facts of Christianity ; but since Christianity did comprise these truths, men might continue to use the old language by speaking of it as a revelation, and as Divine, on the broad ground that all that is true and good in any system comes from God.

Mr. Rose had facts enough to fall back upon ; but he was not mainly concerned with the condition of German Protestantism. He was thinking not of Germany but of England. The danger of intellectual infection was not a remote one, and the question which interested Mr. Rose even more than the devastations of Rationalism was the cause—if any could be assigned—for its prevalence. How had the country and Church of Luther come to repudiate so largely the very substance and heart of the Christian Creed ?

To this question Mr. Rose had a simple answer. It was 'the absence of control.' By control he meant a check upon insurrectionary thought, such as is exerted by subscription to Confessions of Faith, by the use of a settled form of public worship, and by the guidance and discipline of ecclesiastical superiors. In the German Protestant Churches this control either did not exist at all or it was practically useless. The old Lutheran Confessions of Faith—too numerous and too crude for symbolical purposes—were now subscribed only 'so far as they agree with Scripture' ; and such an appended condition of course enabled each subscriber to repudiate so much of the Declaration as in his judgment, whether well or ill informed, did not satisfy it—that is to say, in many cases, to subscribe scarcely anything at all. Thus the relation of Church formularies to Scripture was inverted : the Church formulary, which was intended to guide and fix the private interpretation of

Scripture, was itself interpreted, or even set aside, by that interpretation. The Reformed ministers made no engagement except that of teaching the people according to the Scriptures. Forms of prayer, composed in the sixteenth century, had never been of general obligation or had fallen into disuse; and the constitution of the Lutheran Churches was little capable of restraining the eccentricities of misbelief or unbelief. And it was openly asserted as one of the highest privileges, or rather as being of the very essence of a Protestant Church, that its opinions should constantly change.

Mr. Rose's book at once attracted attention in Germany. An anonymous translation into German appeared at the Leipzig Spring Book-Fair of 1826, some months before Pusey's second visit to Berlin. This translation was introduced by a preface and notes by four other hands denouncing the Church of England, and praising the Rationalists, and, oddly enough, at the same time praising the Wesleyan Methodists, probably as presumed opponents of the Church of England. In October, 1826, while Pusey was reading with Kosegarten at Greifswald, Mr. Rose's book was fiercely attacked in the influential Rationalist organ of Darmstadt, the *Allgemeine Kirchenzeitung*. Then followed a pamphlet by Bretschneider, who represented moderate Rationalism; after him came a writer who had very recently renounced Rationalism for an imperfect but serious faith, Dr. von Ammon. He, however, was irritated by Mr. Rose's language respecting his own earlier books, and by a description of his Latin as 'barbarous'; and accordingly, although agreeing in the general drift of Mr. Rose's work, he attacked it not less fiercely than did Bretschneider. Lastly, the *Allgemeine Repertorium*, edited by Dr. Beck—and containing a sort of epitome of all new works—had a passing fling at Mr. Rose. Each of these critics denounced the Church of England by way of retaliation, and, between them, they must have made Mr. Rose's work known to every German divine of the day.

Pusey heard quite enough about it at Berlin, at Greifs-

wald, and at Bonn. He describes the impression it had made in a letter from Bonn to Mr. Newman, in January, 1827:—

‘I have heard only one voice in favour of Mr. Rose’s book (Schleiermacher’s). The rest whom I have seen, of all the different shades of opinion and earnestness, unite in condemning it. The strongest against it are the most Christian. I have not been able to study the history sufficiently to gain what I wished from conversation on it. I hope, however, from a manuscript of Tholuck’s on the unbelief of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, to obtain hints which I may compare with the views of other men. In its German translation Rose’s book is doing, I am told, a good deal of harm—as “a narrow, partial, bigoted, shallow work” (I am here only a translator) against Rationalism ever must. In England its effects, though not so important, will still, I fear, be prejudicial, especially from the unbounded praise which persons, knowing nothing of the subject, have thoughtlessly bestowed upon it. . . . To write another is, however, very different from censuring this. The present and past state of Germany is, particularly for a foreigner, one of extreme difficulty. One able professor, who has made ecclesiastical history his study, told me that he should not think himself qualified to undertake the task.’

In a letter written a month later Pusey gives, in his own language, a summary of the criticisms which were made on the book at Bonn, in the houses of Professors Sack, Lücke, and Nitzsch:—

‘The feeling excited by the translation of Mr. Rose’s book is excessive among all classes of theologians. It has been, I hear, severely reviewed in two journals and small pamphlets by Winer and Bretschneider. *Non tali auxilio, nec defensoribus istis*. I have hopes that something better will soon appear, though the only full refutation would be an historical view, which it is even yet too early to take. It was perhaps impossible, when the inquiry was only a secondary object, to avoid the mistakes which he [Rose] has made. Yet they have rendered his account such as even in the worst times of Germany had no corresponding reality.

‘The most difficult problem for a foreigner is, when he has ascertained the facts, to know the degree of influence they exerted and the weight to be attached to them. In this Mr. Rose has utterly failed. Besides the absence of connexion in the production of his facts, which you have observed, by which their relative character is entirely missed, and the confusion of dates, he has thrown into one category all the productions and theories of this period, whether they expired as soon as born, or maintained only a brief doubtful and disputed existence, or have

altogether ceased after having exerted considerable influence, or still act upon the existing theology. He has, too, classed together theological and non-theological writers, and considers actuated by the same spirit all who opposed the then existing barren and scholastic orthodoxy, or who ventured to doubt the tenability of any supposed outwork of Christianity.'

Pusey's more intimate friends at Bonn would have been especially irritated by Rose's language about their master—Schleiermacher. But they quarrelled with Rose for virtually misrepresenting German Protestant theology as a whole; while yet they felt that his account contained too much truth to be thrown aside as a caricature. Pusey, they urged, had the opportunities which neither Rose, nor indeed any other Englishman, had at that time enjoyed, of knowing the truth about German Protestantism; and accordingly they pressed him hard to write on the subject. He did not listen very willingly to the suggestion—at least at first. Rose had, he thought, conveyed an impression which was as a whole inaccurate; and yet he was himself 'thoroughly dissatisfied with all the criticisms on Rose which had appeared in Germany.'

In the summer of 1826, however, he had some thoughts of writing on German theology in reference to Rose's book, and had asked and obtained Tholuck's permission to use for this purpose some notes of his lectures in the autumn of 1825, which a friend had offered to lend him. Tholuck's only stipulation was that his name should not be mentioned. He also asked Professor Sack to 'give his opinion in writing upon the principal points in Mr. Rose's book.' This Sack did in a letter which Pusey translated, and to which he at first proposed to write a mere introduction on 'the historical causes of the revolution in German theology.' In the event, Sack's letter became the introduction, and Pusey's introduction the substantial part of the book.

It does not appear that Pusey actually wrote anything on the subject while he was in Germany, or, indeed, before his residence in Brighton in the winter of 1827-28. On February 12, 1828, he writes :—

'I have begun, a few days ago, a little essay on the causes of the unbelief in Germany, which . . . I wish to finish and print in the next few weeks. It will not indeed be many pages, but I must read several books for it. It is, however, principally historical, and therefore easy employment. The Psalms are for a time laid aside.'

A few days later he explains how he had come to set about this task:—

'When at Bonn I asked one of the professors to write me a critique on Mr. Rose's book, on "The State of the Protestant Religion in Germany," which on many accounts I disliked. This he has done, but the translation scarcely being of sufficient bulk to obtain a large circulation, I wish to add a little ballast to it. The Professor's critique will show Rose to have misstated facts: my inquiry, if sound, that he has not gone far enough into principles. Professor Sack, that he has misstated the degree of unbelief: my essay, that he has derived it from wrong causes.'

By the time that he had written thirty pages, he complained of getting on slowly. He was sufficiently alive to the difficulty of his task.

'An additional cargo of biographies'—he writes on March 11—'arrived lately, which I must look through, in hopes of a little additional information for my essay. They are in bad and consequently very tiresome German.'

The consequences of this arrival appear in a letter of March 16th:—

'My essay has not much chance of being presented in a finished state, as I have got but half through it, and only dipped into my biographies. The subject would be, if rightly treated, of such immense extent that I can scarcely open a book which would not give me new illustrations. And I have scrambled from the Reformation to 1800 in seventy pages.'

Two months were to elapse before the work would be published. It appeared on one of the last days in May, 1828, in the week before Pusey's ordination as deacon. He did not anticipate a favourable reception for his book.

'I have, in fact, been unlike other people in my language as in everything else. . . . I do not expect very merciful handling from reviews. The sentiments scattered up and down [the book] will fare still worse than the style; and I expect to be thought one-third

mystic, one-third sceptic, and one-third (which will be thought the worst imputation of all) a Methodist, though I am none of the three.'

In this, his first book, the characteristics of Pusey's later and more matured works are already apparent. That which strikes the reader most of all is the extraordinary industry of the author. Mr. Rose was a divine of ripe years, and of solid learning; but his 'Discourses,' in their earlier form, read like the superficial treatment of a great subject when they are placed side by side with Pusey's 'Theology of Germany.' At the age of twenty-seven, amid the pressure of other absorbing studies, and, as our readers know, of the strongest personal and domestic interests and anxieties, not to mention the depressing effects of continued ill health, he had contrived to bring together an amount of research, extending over a period of two centuries and a half, at which his German critics and translators themselves were fairly astonished.

As to the question of fact there is not much difference between Rose and Pusey. Each makes admissions which justify the main features of his opponent's position. Rose, while maintaining that 'the Protestant Church of Germany is the mere shadow of a name,' since it had been guilty, practically, of an 'abdication of Christianity,' yet allows, somewhat inconsistently, that the prevalent Rationalism 'produced very strong and serious disgust,' and that 'some of the sounder theologians certainly maintained the old and orthodox principles with great zeal.' Pusey, while insisting that 'the German people has on the whole remained true and attached to the faith of their fathers,' admits, as a fact, the 'unbelief' of 'a large portion of its speculating minds,' although, in his sanguine manner, he describes this unbelief as only 'temporary.' Pusey had left the question of fact to Professor Sack. Sack, while complaining of Rose for confusing the language of German philosophers with that of German theologians, and for not noticing sufficiently 'the counterworkings by which the further progress of unbelief was, even in the worst and most perplexed times, opposed and checked,' yet admits his 'feeling of pain' that 'so much

evil could be said of the theological authors of any country which it is impossible to clear away.' He cannot deny that 'the distinctive and specially revolting characteristic of the German Rationalism consists in its having made its appearance within the Church, and in the guise of theology.' Mr. Rose could say, without exaggeration, as far as the facts of the religious situation in Germany were concerned, that 'Mr. Pusey's work bears me out in every material statement which I have made¹.'

The real differences between Rose and Pusey begin when they proceed to account for the fact as to the existence of which they are substantially agreed. This account was indeed the main purpose of Pusey's book: it is entitled, 'An Historical Enquiry into the Probable Causes of the Rationalist Character of the Theology of Germany,' which he describes as 'lately predominant.' Rose had, as has been stated, explained this predominance of Rationalism by the inadequacy of their confessions, of their forms of prayer, and of their Church organization. Pusey, on the other hand, traced the Rationalism of Germany principally to the Lutheran 'orthodoxy' of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. He coined the word 'orthodoxy' to express his meaning that it was not a true and healthy, but a stiff and false orthodoxy which was in question: 'an orthodoxy which clung to the mere letter of a certain sum of credenda without, or with very little reference to anything further.' This account of the matter, he used to say, was first suggested to him by the historian Neander.

'I asked Neander,' he said in 1878, 'what he thought was the cause of German Rationalism: he answered, "The dead orthodoxy," which in my first book on Germany I translated into "orthodoxy," by which, I supposed, people would understand that I meant a defect. But they did not; and hence came the reports, I suppose, that I myself was lax in belief.'

The rise of Lutheran 'orthodoxy' Pusey explains by the failure of Lutheranism to complete the Reformation, as originally intended by Luther. Such a Luther as Pusey

¹ Rose, 'Letter to the Bishop of London,' 1829, p. 18.

then conceived him to be might, he thought, had he only possessed sufficient leisure and control, have produced a Reformed Church in which Rationalism would have had no place; since whatever there was of reason in its demands and efforts would have been anticipated. But Luther was obliged largely to devote his time to practical duties and employments, and his successors did not inherit 'the great views' of their master. They set themselves to 'develop, to the utmost, subordinate but contested points' in Luther's system; and the consequence was seen in 'internal divisions,' which in turn rendered, or were supposed to render, necessary new and narrow confessions of faith. Of these confessions the most mischievous, 'because at last almost universally received,' was the 'Formula of Concord,' which in 1580 was practically imposed upon the whole Lutheran Communion, to the prejudice of authoritative works of an earlier and better type, such as the *loci theologici* of Melancthon. Thenceforward nothing remained for Lutheran divines 'but to proceed in the groove into which they had been forced to enter; to develop in still greater minuteness the fixed immutable definitions of the sanctioned form; to offer solutions of its difficulties and to refute its opponents.'

The consequences are traced by Pusey in the various fields of Biblical interpretation, dogmatic and moral theology, ecclesiastical history, practical and pastoral theology. Scripture was treated as little better than a storehouse of *loci classici* to prove the symbolical books. In Spener's day a man might study theology for six years at a German University without hearing a single exposition of any book of the Bible. Dogmatic theology was hard, technical, and polemical. For the fruitful study of Christian morality there was neither time nor room. The study of Ecclesiastical history in any serious sense was wellnigh extinct. Catechetical instruction was either degraded to the level of dry polemics, or altogether neglected. The pulpit could indeed claim some few names of sterling merit; but, for the most part, in the words of the historian Shröckh, preaching

‘remained a science almost entirely unknown to those who deemed that they most excelled in it.’ Sermons were delivered in ‘scholastic terminology’: they did not lack orthodoxy, but the development of orthodoxy in its influence on Christian practice. They consisted ordinarily of a ‘dry grammatical exposition of Scriptural texts, and a polemical or so-called practical application equally uninteresting and uninfluential.’

The revolt against this barren and deadening ‘orthodoxism’ in the Lutheran body is described by Pusey with glowing sympathy. This resistance began with men of great piety, such as Praetorius and Arndt; it was continued by a ‘scientific’ theologian, Calixtus, whose ceaseless efforts to promote a better understanding between separated bodies of Christians were treated as the results of indifference. But it culminated in Spener and the Pietist school of Halle, who continued, although with greater power and wider influence, the earlier work of Arndt. Pietism is described by Pusey as ‘a recurrence from human forms and human systems to the pure source of faith in Scripture; a substitution of practical religion for scholastic subtleties and unfruitful speculation.’ Pietism, however, in turn degenerated; it lived on as a phraseology when its spirit had departed. Hypocrisy was engendered by the stress laid upon private edifying and Christian conversation; abstinence from worldly amusements became a source of self-deception and of breaches of Christian charity; while knowledge was, in certain quarters, discredited as unspiritual, or at least as not aiding the practical side of Christianity. Pietism was thus on its way to prepare the advent of Rationalism. In addition to this and to the influence of ‘orthodoxism,’ Pusey regarded as the most directly operative causes of unbelief the spread of the Wolfian philosophy, the moral faults of the age, conspicuously illustrated in Frederick II., and the translations of the works of English Deists, then largely circulated together with inadequate refutations.

When he comes to describe the ‘lately predominant

Rationalism,' Pusey differs from Rose in two respects. His picture of it is less dark, and his forecast of the religious future of Germany is much more sanguine. Even Semler, 'the most direct founder of the innovating school,' is treated by him with marked tenderness; Semler's errors are regarded as misapprehensions of principle rather than direct rejections of fundamental doctrines, and as ultimately traceable to 'intellectual defects,' or to 'his sense of the necessities of theology.' If Steinbart had lost 'everything in Christianity peculiarly Christian, and even the more earnest aspirations of the natural man,' yet 'his object was to lead the sceptics of his time to the acceptance of Christianity.' But of course Pusey has nothing to say for writers such as Teller and Spalding, who 'confined themselves to the unenlivening Christianity by substituting commonplace moral notions for its energetic doctrines, declaring them to be of importance only to the theologian, or polemizing against them under the title of the Oriental idioms of the New Testament.'

Not the least interesting part of this division of his work is his account of influences, separate from or opposed to the predominant Rationalism. His admiration of the poet Claudius—whom to the end of his life he was fond of quoting—finds expression in a passage of great warmth and beauty: the German love for Claudius of itself proved that Germany was at heart Christian. Lessing, he tells us, in whom fondness for elegant literature and the arts was 'ennervated moral earnestness,' yet rendered considerable services to Christianity by restoring the key to the right understanding of the Old Testament; by referring to the Bible as its own best advocate; and by insisting that if Reason finds in Revelation things which it cannot explain, this is an argument in favour of Revelation. For Herder, especially for Herder's later writings, he has less to say, except that 'while everything seems to float in a dim mist, many a hint is discoverable which may be pursued to clearer and enlarged views.' The account of Kant, Hegel, Schelling, and Jacobi, in their relations to the older

Rationalism, and to Religion, is—even after half a century of comment on their writings—fresh and terse; and it serves as an introduction to the forms of Rationalistic thought which were current in the later years of Pusey's life. Of Hegel, whom he met in Berlin, and who was still living, he says nothing. Pusey's optimism as to the existing condition of German Protestantism appears in the statement that 'among theologians the only adherents of the strict Rationalistic school of any note were Wegscheider and Röhr.' He anticipates that religion will permanently be a gainer from its rude contact with Rationalism; and concludes with a long quotation from Twesten, which, whatever its failures as an attempted prophecy, is interesting as illustrating Pusey's enthusiasm at the moment, and the aspects of German religious life which Rose had overlooked, and which justified, as he himself thought, his own more hopeful forecast of the theological future of the country.

Apart from his controversy with Mr. Rose, this first of Pusey's books throws an interesting light upon the workings of his mind at this period. It contains many features of language if not of thought which he subsequently outgrew or repudiated. His German friends had taught him to speak of 'the scientific spirit,' 'freedom from prejudice,' and 'a new era in theology'; for the time he was undoubtedly influenced by them in his statements both about the inspiration of Holy Scripture, and about the Creeds, as well as in his unbalanced estimate of some of the leaders in the continental reformation. But his own immediate explanations show that at this date he had not fully considered what his words might imply to others, nor in what sort of system his phrases and judgments would be really at home.

On the other hand, there is much in this book which recalls his later work. *Pectus facit theologum*. If Pusey uses some theological expressions which he would afterwards have repudiated, he differs markedly from writers to whom such expressions would be more congenial, by the earnest moral and religious interest which runs through his

book. An example of this occurs in his criticism upon Steinbart, who, while endeavouring to 'lead the sceptics of his time to the acceptance of Christianity,' was wanting; Pusey complains, in 'all deeper views of the holiness of God, of the spiritual degeneracy and spiritual capabilities of man, and of the means by which the lost energy may be restored.' Indeed, Pusey's judgments are generally coloured, if not determined, by moral considerations. Michaelis' want of 'deep insight into religion' is explained by his 'intemperate habits and low moral character.' Eichhorn, although an 'original and elegant mind,' loves novelty to the comparative disregard of truth. Herder, as an 'aestheticist,' defends Christianity, on account of its 'loveliness,' rather than as the only way to holiness. The errors of Semler and Ernesti are alike attributed to the 'want of that deeper insight into the nature of religion which a constantly improving personal Christianity alone can give.' On the other hand, he entertains sanguine expectations respecting the religious future of Protestant Germany, on account of the 'deep moral earnestness' of many of those who 'yet remain strangers to the main Christian doctrines.' And he lavishes his warmest spiritual sympathies on Arndt, Andrea, the Pietistic school of Halle, and above all on Spener¹.

The book was soon translated into German. When Lücke wrote from Göttingen to congratulate Pusey on his

¹ In Pusey's feeling about Spener there is something presentimental. In their combination of devotional and literary interests, in their 'use of an antiquated and involved style, and of a conscientious anxiety to prevent misconception,' in the fierceness of the opposition which each of them roused, in their over-indulgent judgment of their friends, in their opposition to worldly amusements, to luxury, to dancing and theatres, as well as in the combination of indomitable resolution, with unusual gentleness towards others and unaffected self-depreciation,—Spener and Pusey resembled each other closely. The instinct of similarity of character may have had

something to do with Pusey's admiration for a man whose life anticipated, in some of its leading features, the circumstances of his own. That Pusey made Spener for some time a model for imitation is certain on independent grounds; but it also would seem to be implied in these features of Spener's character on which Pusey principally dwells with reverent admiration. 'He who would form a full idea of Spener's humility,' writes Pusey, 'must by the grace and mercy of God first become as great in it as God made this now sainted person.' As a theologian, however, Spener was not so acceptable to Pusey in his later as in his earlier years.

appointment to the Hebrew chair in 1828, he alludes to a translation which he had seen some time before; and Tholuck speaks of this translation at length in a letter of June 3, 1829. The only German translation which the present writer has seen was not published, however, until eight years after the appearance of the original¹. It is in many respects a new work. Much is omitted which would be familiar to a German reader. Observations which break the continuity of the subject are suppressed; and the method of the 'translation' is undeniably better than that of the original. Some errors, too, are corrected. In their preface the translators observe that the stiff Lutheran orthodoxy which followed upon the Reformation period had often been described before. Pusey's originality consisted in the account of the opposition to it from Calixtus, Spener, Semler, and the Rationalists: no previous writer had handled this topic, and especially so much of it as was connected with the school of Halle, in so masterly a manner.

Upon receiving a copy of the book Mr. Rose at once wrote an acknowledgment, asking Pusey for information about the practice of subscription in Germany, but adding significantly that there were other points upon which he could not presume to address him in private.

He at once gave notice in the London papers that 'Strictures' on Mr. Pusey would shortly be published. He was, however, interrupted in the task of writing them by severe illness; and his 'Letter to the Bishop of London in Reply to Mr. Pusey's work on the Causes of German Rationalism' did not appear until May, 1829.

For the tone and substance of this letter Pusey could not have been unprepared. The questions about his own orthodoxy which were raised at the time of his appointment to the Chair of Hebrew in the late autumn of 1828 must have shown him pretty plainly the direction which criticism

¹ 'Das Aufkommen und Sinken des Rationalismus in Deutschland: Ein historischer Versuch nach dem Englischen des E. B. Pusey bearbeitet von Dr. Ch. H. F. Bialloblotzky, Pastor,

und M. F. Sander, Evangel. Prediger zu Wichlinghausen.' Elberfeld: Verlag von J. W. Schmachtenberg, 1836.

would take. Nor was this all. An American periodical, the *Biblical Repertory*, among its contents for January, 1828, had published an authorized translation of those notes of Professor Tholuck's lectures, which Pusey had been allowed to use on condition of not alluding to their author. In October Rose in a private letter called Pusey's attention to this seeming plagiarism, offering at the same time to publish by way of explanation any statement which Pusey might send him in reply. Pusey explained what had happened, and pointed out that he had called attention to his obligation, so far as Tholuck permitted him to acknowledge it, in the closing sentence of the preface to his book. At the same time, he maintained that while he was indebted to Tholuck, as indeed to Twisten and others, for facts, the inferences were his own. The main thesis of his work, that the dead Lutheran 'orthodoxism' was the deepest cause of German Rationalism, had been suggested to him by Neander. The whole outline of his book had been completed before he actually received his friend's notes of Tholuck's lectures. He had, in fact, been living in the intellectual atmosphere of which those lectures were a product; and it would have been strange if his book had not presented points of similarity beyond the matter for which he was indebted to Tholuck. Rose did not know Pusey sufficiently to do full credit to his candour even in this later explanation; but in the judgment of a Reviewer who does not conceal his hostility to Pusey's point of view, Pusey had already said enough in his preface to 'place his literary honour and literary gratitude above suspicion¹.'

Pusey, however, had also to set himself right with Tholuck. In the spring of 1829 Tholuck was in Rome, where he met Philip Pusey, of whom he saw a great deal. 'He reminds me,' Tholuck playfully writes, 'of many of your peculiarities, which has done me good.' From him Tholuck had obtained a sight of the 'Theology of Germany.' England, he thought, was to be congratulated on having at last German theology represented to her 'in a liberal yet

¹ *British Critic*, Oct. 1829, p. 483.

Christian spirit.' But the book was not, in Tholuck's judgment, without defects; its drift was not apparent at a glance; its statements not sufficiently detailed; it took too much for granted in an ordinary reader and would not produce in him sufficiently vivid impressions. Then Tholuck gently adds that in the general structure, as well as in the details of his book, Pusey had followed his lectures, and proceeds:—

'I confess that I should have wished—and you will excuse a wish so natural in the circumstances—that you had asked my opinion about it. However, I sincerely rejoice if you can hope to have done good in this way. I myself must regard my work as a very imperfect sketch, to elaborate which I should need many years and much reading.'

It drew from Pusey the subjoined reply:—

E. B. P. TO PROFESSOR THOLUCK.

MY DEAR AND VALUED FRIEND,

Oxford, April 28, [1829.]

I cannot say how much I felt the kindness of your letter, which I have just received through my brother: I felt it the more since you must have thought that I had acted wrongly towards you.

It is so long since I asked your permission to employ the notes of your lectures that I am not surprised, though sorry, that you have forgotten it: but perhaps the mention of the circumstances and locality may recall it. It was during the short time when I had the pleasure of reseeing you at Schönhausen in 1826. We left Prediger Weiss's at Schönhausen together, and walked up and down by the trees which edge the road to Berlin. I then asked you several questions on the subject of modern German theology, which made you ask me whether I was going to write upon it. I said that I wished to do so, in consequence of Mr. Rose's book, and that some notes from your lectures in October, 1825, had been offered me. You then told me that I was welcome to make any use which I pleased of your lectures, but that you wished me not to name you. This occasioned my mentioning the manuscript without your name in my preface. I sent the book with fuller acknowledgments to you in a note by my friend Jelf at Berlin, not knowing that you were absent at Rome.

I have now been obliged to explain myself more fully in consequence of the appearance of your lectures in America with your name. Mr. Rose mentioned the fact to me (for I have not yet seen them myself) and asked an explanation. . . . I have therefore been obliged to state both what I have borrowed from the notes to your lectures, and what I have not. It has been very unpleasant to me, for I have been

obliged to dwell more upon what I do not owe to you, than upon what I do. . . .

I have written this long explanation for fear at a distance you should misconceive anything which I have said or done, and it would extremely pain me to stand less high in your regard than you before kindly allowed me.

This letter more than satisfied Tholuck. He replied that he had forgotten, but could now recall, the conversation at Schönhausen, when he had given Pusey permission to use the notes of his lectures. He had supposed that Pusey's intended work would be written in a much more distant future, as when they discussed it Pusey had formed no plan for its composition. Of Pusey's honourable conduct he needed no assurance. 'I have never,' he wrote, 'forgotten or doubted your true refinement and delicacy of feeling.' He went on to express his sense of the research which certain parts of his book showed.

In his 'Letter' to Bishop Blomfield, Mr. Rose claims that the assertions in his sermons are borne out by Pusey's admissions. He then replies to Pusey in detail; to Pusey's Preface, to Professor Sack's Letter, and to Pusey's work itself. He reasserts and defends the position taken up in his sermons, and attempts to show at length the inadequacy and historical inaccuracy of Pusey's account of German Rationalism.

But in fact Mr. Rose was even more at issue with what he conceived to be the indirect consequences and general drift of Pusey's work than with its historical statements. He severely criticized Pusey's picture of certain shadowy advantages supposed to have been derived from Rationalistic speculation, and his insistence on these advantages without any due consideration of the immense spiritual loss by which they were accompanied and outweighed. Much also of Pusey's sanguine phraseology adopted from his German friends, as that respecting a 'new era in theology' and the 'blending of belief and science,' was very offensive to Mr. Rose; but the point of which he made the most serious complaint was, as he calls it, 'the method in which

Mr. Pusey expresses his conviction of the absurdity of believing in the inspiration of the historical parts of Scripture.' This language, however unintentionally, gravely misrepresented what Pusey really meant to say; but as in later years Pusey abandoned both his original statement and his earlier defence of it, perhaps Rose's instinct was justified, even if his accuracy was at fault.

On many other points Mr. Rose misunderstood Pusey's book; 'he has,' as Pusey said to Tholuck, 'misstated every view which he has attacked as mine.' This, however, was not very astonishing. It was to a great extent Pusey's own fault. His style was far from clear¹; his method wanted system and elaboration; he was at that time, as he afterwards admitted, not by any means invulnerable as a theologian. But still his command of his subject was wider than that of Mr. Rose, and the latter evidently underrated his ability, his knowledge, and his orthodoxy. It was, indeed, very natural that Mr. Rose and his friends should complain of the apparent absence of any good practical object in Pusey's 'Enquiry.' If Mr. Rose's charges against German theology were erroneous, they argued, they might be disproved. Pusey had not done this; he had, in the main, admitted the justice of Mr. Rose's representation. What then was to be gained by giving a somewhat paradoxical account, as it might have seemed, of a deplorable phenomenon, by tracing German rationalism to the stiff and sterile orthodoxy of the Lutheran theology of the seventeenth century? The answer is that Pusey was thinking less of Germany than of England. It seemed to him that it would be immodest in a young man of twenty-eight, not yet in Holy Orders, to say in so many words that the attitude of the English High

¹ 'Letters and Correspondence' of J. H. N., i. p. 186. Pusey's book 'is sadly deformed with Germanisms: he is wantonly obscure and foreign;—he invents words. It is a very valuable sketch, and will do good, but will be sadly misunderstood both from his difficulty of expressing himself, the largeness, profundity, and novelty of his views, and the independence of his

radicalism. It is *very* difficult, even for his friends and the clearest heads, to enter into his originality, full formed [sic] accuracy, and unsystematic impartiality. I cannot express what I mean: he is like some definitely marked curve, meandering through all sorts and collections of opinions boldly, yet as it seems irregularly.'

and dry Churchmen towards spiritual religion, and the attitude of the English Evangelicals towards theological knowledge, were not without peril to the faith; and that the experience of Protestant Germany, in circumstances different yet analogous, might not improbably be repeated at home. Yet this is what he really meant. Allusive writing is open to two objections. Its point is missed by the majority of readers; and the analogies on which it presumes are apt to be precarious or forced. Pusey did not escape reflections on the unpractical nature of an effort which devoted 'the fruits of great erudition and labour to building or propping up a fanciful theory,' which, whether true or not, had, in the mistaken judgment of his critics, no value or importance whatever¹.

Pusey, of course, sent copies of his book to several Oriel friends, and among them to Keble, Newman, and Blanco White. Of these the last only received it with entire approval. Eighteen years had passed since Blanco White had left for ever the communion of the Church of Rome and his native Spain. He was now a naturalized Englishman. The University of Oxford had given him the degree of M.A., and Oriel College had made him a member of its Common-room. He was chiefly connected with Whately; but he was more or less intimate with all the Fellows of Oriel who were in residence. Newman and Pusey were the companions of his walks. In his diary, he writes:—

'Oct. 31st [1827].—Called on Pusey, who walked with me. Pusey, Wilberforce, and Froude came in the evening to learn the order of the R. C. Service of the Breviary².'

His mind had not yet definitely taken that last turn in its chequered career which led in the sequel to his loss of all definitely Christian faith; but it was near doing so. Pusey's book for a moment seemed to arrest him: and he thus gratefully acknowledged it from Tunbridge Wells, where he was in declining health:—

¹ Cf. e.g. *British Critic*, Oct. 1829, p. 484.

² 'Life of Joseph Blanco White,' i. 438, 439.

REV. BLANCO WHITE TO E. B. P.

MY DEAR FRIEND,

Tunbridge Wells, June 10, 1828.

I have employed the whole of this day in reading your essay, and feel confident that few days of my life have been employed more profitably. Why should I use the usual language of compliment? You have strengthened my faith, and made me pray more earnestly for light. How wonderfully well you have described the spirit and the aberrations of the Pietists is more than I can express. The whole work is full of piety, as well as of sound philosophical views. I long to be near you that I may have the opportunity of receiving instruction. Thanks be to God, He has enabled me to seize the citadel without stopping to raze every outwork of the enemy. Else I should often have relapsed into the hopelessness of scepticism. But I have to thank you, as God's instrument in showing to me that I was acting in conformity with the best principles of my nature. You appear to me to have developed my own crude thoughts. You have also checked the growth of some weeds which were breaking out in the long uncultivated ground of my mind. Indeed, from time to time Divine Providence has placed before me such works as were most fitted to my then state of mind. Yours is among the most eminent of such instances.

Before Mr. Rose's 'Letter' appeared, Keble had, at Pusey's request, criticized his book: he especially commented unfavourably on Pusey's language respecting the inspiration of the historical books of Holy Scripture. Pusey acknowledged that he had not expressed his meaning very clearly, and restated his position on this point.

E. B. P. TO REV. J. KEBLE. April 18, 1829.

On 'historical inspiration' I own, that, if taken in its most extensive and rigid sense, I have felt myself obliged to abandon it: that is, if applied to all the minute facts, not immediately connected with religious truth. The promises of our Saviour seemed to me confined to this: in everything then which bore upon this I believe that the Apostles were assisted; in other things in which I do not myself see this reference I should not presume to define what was or what was not the result of inspiration; yet I am prevented from extending it to all by what appear to me in minute collateral points to be historical contradictions. I hope I shall not give you pain by admitting this: it has no effect in diminishing in the least the *practical* value of Scripture, but seems to me to be the truth and to get rid of *theoretical* difficulties. In any matter of practice or of doctrine the authority of Scripture is to me as great as to those who hold the most plenary inspiration.

Keble answered this by completing his criticism on the book with some very characteristic observations:—

‘April 19, 1829.

‘You are so indulgent to my crude criticisms that I will make no scruple of just mentioning one or two doubts which have occurred to me in reading your book. . . .

‘I cannot quite reconcile myself to your statement with regard to the authenticity of the Scriptural books, nor can I understand how I can have the same value for the Epistle to the Hebrews (for example) whether I think it inspired or no. Perhaps I am misconstruing the sentence I refer to. . . .

‘I much question the wisdom and practical kindness of “collecting doubts as strongly as they can be put” in a published work. The persons *first* to be considered in all religious publications, I should say, are the unlearned good sort of people: and if the learned have doubts, why should they not correspond among themselves till they find answers, instead of disturbing the devotions as well as the opinions of their quiet neighbours?’

One sentence of Pusey’s answer may be quoted:—

[May 5, 1829.]

‘Mr. Rose’s attack upon me has at length appeared: I am now too much aware of my liability to misconception to think any misconception wilful, although he has misconceived and misstated me in every instance.’

Pusey was soon hard at work on a reply to Rose, which became the second part of his ‘Historical Enquiry into the Causes of German Rationalism.’ Of this work the greater part was written during the first two months of the Long Vacation of 1829. Newman’s earliest extant letter to Pusey himself on the subject belongs to this period.

REV. J. H. NEWMAN TO E. B. P.

Oriel College, Aug. 31, 1829.

. . . . I am glad to hear from your brother that you are humanizing and dulcifying your book, though I do not recollect many very harsh things in it. It has since struck me that you have nowhere entered a protest against an approval of schism. And since the Bishop of London thinks your censure of a rigid traditionary system in a Church casts suspicion on the soundness of your ecclesiastical views, it might be as well to disclaim any opinions favourable to self-willed separation from the Church, and in so doing, I will venture to say, you will be doing as much to the sweetening of your book (especially if you say some sharp things against Dissenters) as by your humanities towards Mr. R——. . . .

Yours ever affectionately,

J. H. NEWMAN.

Although Pusey adopted Newman's hint, his answer does not betray any suspicion of the worldly wisdom or humour of the suggestion with regard to the most probable means of securing the favour of the Bishop of London.

E. B. P. TO REV. J. H. NEWMAN.

[Sept. 1829.]

I have sent the first five chapters of my book (including Inspiration and the Fathers) to the press, but not had any of it back. There are some parts which I want you much to see, especially one in which, *à propos* of Irenaeus, I have made some observations (I believe in your spirit) on the Inspiration of the Church, and, as if justifying Irenaeus, have said that there was nothing harsh in supposing that those who wilfully so separated from the Church excluded themselves from *some* of the benefits intended by God for us, since some can only, it appears, be thus conveyed; and I have said proof might be brought from the partial manner in which Christianity has generally been embraced by separatist bodies. What think you of this?

The lengthy passage on Inspiration was the subject of much correspondence with Newman, who helped Pusey especially in making a catena of passages from Anglican writers, in addition to the Patristic evidence which Pusey had collected. The Anglican authorities were intended as 'illustrations of the Fathers.' But eventually, by Dr. Hawkins' advice, this elaborately prepared piece of work was altogether omitted: and if the omission deprived Pusey's second volume of a constructive statement of permanent value, it at least prevented a controversy already too intricate from becoming still further involved.

Pusey was evidently much more anxious about the second part of his work than he had been about the first. Besides consulting Keble, Newman, and the Provost of Oriel, he sent the proof-sheets to Dr. Blomfield, the Bishop of London, asking for criticisms and corrections.

The Bishop criticized Pusey's proof-sheets in two letters of great length¹. Nothing but a sense of the importance of the questions at stake could have led a man, to whom time and strength were so precious, to devote so much attention to a young professor. Pusey's candour and

¹ Dated January 4 and January 16, 1830. Each is of nine quarto pages, closely written.

moderation were commended ; and the Bishop did not consider himself pledged to all Mr. Rose's opinions. But he could not approve of several features in Pusey's 'Explanation.' He objected to the word 'orthodoxy,' as it would be generally understood to imply a 'sarcasm upon those who attach great importance to a right system of belief,' 'a blind and uninquiring orthodoxy.' Pusey's eulogies of 'the earnestness of mind and love for God' which were to be found among German Rationalists were more than charity required, and tended to strengthen the opinion that Rationalistic error did not 'affect the essence of religion.' As to the restraining influence of Episcopacy, Pusey had misstated the question at issue ; which was, not whether any one form of Church government could 'prevent a general defection' from Christianity, but whether 'the German Churches' might not have been saved from their recent trials 'if they had been governed according to the platform of Apostolical discipline.' Pusey had said that articles of faith are useful, but not necessary to the existence of a Church. Was Pusey arguing against articles altogether, or against the abuse of them? Pusey had spoken of 'the satisfaction of the Sacrifice of Christ to God's infinite justice' as a 'human system.' 'Infinite justice,' says the Bishop, is an 'unmeaning expression'; but the doctrine that a perfect satisfaction was made to God by the Death of Christ was the doctrine of the Church of England, and stands on a very different footing from that of imputed righteousness. The Bishop apologized for the freedom of his criticisms ; he was anxious that Pusey's 'abilities and learning' should be made 'as serviceable as they ought to be to the cause of our Church.'

Pusey was vexed. He wanted positive assistance, and he saw in the Bishop's letter, from which he had anticipated much, only fault-finding without the suggestion of any corrections, and in reply he told the Bishop that he should find it difficult to alter what he had written, specially about articles of faith. The Bishop insists, in his second letter, that considerable alterations are necessary: and repeats

with great clearness and force the reasons which make articles of faith absolutely necessary to the teaching office of the Christian Church. In still stronger language does he object to Pusey's statement that 'the reception of every portion of Scripture is no criterion of sound views nor essential to Christianity.' By applying this theory 'to each part of the Canon, the whole Canon might be proved to be unessential to Christianity. Pusey's explanation as it stood would only make matters worse.'

It is impossible not to feel that, at a later period, Pusey would have admitted the justice of most of Bishop Blomfield's criticisms. As it was, he altered his proofs in several places as the Bishop had suggested. This delayed the appearance of his volume until May. Upon sending the corrected proofs to the Bishop, he received the subjoined acknowledgment:—

THE BISHOP OF LONDON TO E. B. P.

London, Feb. 1, 1830.

. . . . The alterations which you have proposed will in great measure obviate the objections which I made; although I am bound in candour to say that the tone of your explanation will not be altogether satisfactory to me, with reference to the effect which it may produce upon the minds of younger students in theology.

I remain, Rev. Sir, your faithful servant,

C. J. LONDON.

P.S.—I wish there were any prospect of your being able to bring your notions to bear, concerning theological studies in the University, as suggested in p. 136.

The second part of the 'Theology of Germany' appeared in May, 1830: the preface is dated March 30. Of its eleven chapters, the first seven are devoted by the author to a defence of himself against the charges brought against him by Mr. Rose; the last four, partly to an expansion, partly to a slight modification of his earlier account of the history of German Protestant theology. To the charge that he took no account of the absence of Episcopacy as one of the causes of German Rationalism, Pusey virtually pleads guilty. He could 'not see that a different form of Church government would have changed the destinies of

the German Church.' The 'utmost which human authority can avail in opposition to unbelief is to repress its outward appearance.' He did not, indeed, doubt that Episcopacy was better adapted than any other form for all the purposes of Church government. He thought 'that a genuine Episcopal form of government, combined with the Synods, would be a permanent blessing to the German Church.' But he maintained that there was no reason to think that orthodox Lutherans would have dealt wisely with Rationalism, by 'discriminating between human additions and the original truth,' had they 'been invested with Episcopal authority.' Pusey had not quite realized, as Rose had in fact implicitly asserted, that the Episcopate is an organic feature of the Church of Christ, the absence of which could not but be attended by spiritual disorder.

To the charge of having disparaged the English Articles, as well as the German Protestant confessions of faith, Pusey replies that his criticisms, however general in form, were really directed against the 'later German Articles,' particularly the Formula of Concord, and the Articles of Smalcald, and to the exclusion of the Confession of Augsburg, as well as of the English Articles. Some Articles, he held, were absolutely necessary to the well-being of a Church : a mere subscription to Holy Scripture was absolutely nugatory.

Rose's gravest charge, as Pusey himself thought it, turned on the Inspiration of Scripture. Pusey, in his first book, would not allow that historical passages, in which no religious truth was contained, were equally inspired with the rest. Rose had unintentionally substituted the word 'parts' for 'passages'; and then had represented Pusey as implying that a belief in the inspiration of the Gospels was a vulgar error.

Pusey pointed out how Mr. Rose had misinterpreted him, and proceeds to give an account of that theory of inspiration which had prevailed in Germany in the seventeenth century, and against which he had used the words in question. Luther had regarded inspiration only as a continued act of revelation of religious truth. Towards

the end of the sixteenth century this theory was tacitly abandoned, and replaced by another which extended inspiration to every word and thing in Scripture. The Hebrew points were regarded as authentic, because the verbal inspiration could not otherwise be maintained¹. Syllables were inspired as well as words and facts². It was this exaggerated idea of inspiration which had led to disbelief in inspiration. It had been originally adopted as furnishing a firm controversial ground against Rome; but expediency is not a good reason for tampering with truth. In defence of his own opinion Pusey claims to show that the same *principles* as his own had been held, as by the Fathers, so by divines such as De Dominis, Warburton, Secker, Lowth, Tillotson, Archdeacon Powell, and, among living divines, Bishop Van Mildert, and Bishop Blomfield himself³.

Pusey complains bitterly of having been accused of maintaining the 'monstrous supposition' that 'the scattering doubts as to the truth of religion or the genuineness of Scripture is not an evil, merely because it may call forth a reply.' Mr. Rose had overlooked Pusey's words, that 'where doubts have acquired a general prevalence, it is an unquestionable service to collect these doubts as strongly as they are capable of being put.' Pusey only wished doubts to be recognized that they might be set at rest; he had as little sympathy as Rose himself with any promulgation of them, which either aimed at or even disregarded the unsettlement of the faith of others.

The interest of the latter part of the book is direct and historical rather than polemical and incidental. Nowhere else in our language is there so full an account of the active life of the German Protestant Church in the seventeenth century, of its various studies, and of its religious condition. The illustrations of German preaching and exegesis are especially good; and the accounts of Andrea, Spener, and Reinhard are full of deep and varied interest.

¹ Gerhard, 'Loc. Theol.,' ch. xv. § 391, qu. 'Theol. Germ.,' ii. 71, note 2.

² Pfaff, Lect. 11 in Mt., p. 16, ap. Pusey, *ubi sup.*

³ 'Theol. Germ.,' ii. 75-86.

The two books on the theology of Germany represented an effort which would have sufficed for the energies of many divines, although viewed in the light of Pusey's later labours they are insignificant. He never, however, referred to them without regret and self-condemnation. He maintained, indeed, to the last that his object was, then as always, to explain and justify Revelation, and to oppose unbelief. But at his first contact with German thought he had formed an incorrect estimate of its real bearing. He had been too sanguine as to the efforts of writers like Tholuck and Neander: he had not been sufficiently alive to the character and extent of the concessions which they had made to the enemies of faith. He had to explain what he had written; to repeat his explanations; to justify his consistency of motive, and his change in theological attitude.

Of the many topics handled in these volumes, the one which was remembered against him, and which gave him most trouble in later years, was his language on the Inspiration of Holy Scripture. It led him first of all to publish a retraction in the letters addressed to a friend, and subsequently published in the *Record* of April 5th, 19th, and 26th, 1841. They were written, it will be remembered, within a few weeks after the publication of Tract 90.

E. B. P. TO T. H.

Christ Church, March 27, 1841.

. . . It is shocking even to have to state that I always believed the inspiration and Divine authority of all Holy Scriptures. . . . I never otherwise held Holy Scripture than as given by inspiration of God, nor do I now place antiquity and tradition instead of the Bible. I appeal to primitive antiquity as the expositor of Holy Scripture, not in contrast with God's Word, which it is to expound, but with the private interpretations of modern individuals.

In the next letter he says:—

‘It is shocking to have again to repeat that I never had any notion of vindicating German Neology, which the writer says was the whole object of my work,—that I never denied to any portion of the Bible the character of Holy Scripture; nor did I ever doubt its plenary inspiration.

'A few words on these points. Throughout my first book on German theology I spoke of and implied Rationalism to be a great and destructive evil. How could I do otherwise? My only difference from Mr. Rose's view was as to its causes, not to its character. . . . So far from being "a disciple of the Neologians," my intimate friends in Germany were those . . . who have been, under God, the chief instruments in restoring a sounder faith. I may have differed again from Mr. Rose as to the extent of the prevalence of Neology, not as to its destructiveness. . . .

'As the subject has been revived, I am glad of an opportunity of expressing regret of having ever spoken upon the subject [of minute discrepancies in Holy Scripture] at all, and in whatever degree it be thought to disparage my judgement generally that I once held what Luther implies, I willingly submit to it; only the charge should not be extended further than the truth. I ever believed the plenary inspiration of the whole Bible and every sentence in it, as far as any doctrine or practice can be elicited from it. I ever believed the human instruments to have been guided by God's Holy Spirit, and that the Holy Spirit never failed them: only I did not think that while He guided them "into all truth," this guidance extended into such minute details and circumstances as in no way affected the truth. I never needed any other authority or acknowledged any other source of saving truth. I appealed to antiquity as subordinate to Holy Scripture, and superior only to moderns, as the Homilies and the Reformers acknowledge it to be.'

Again and again the echoes of the controversy were heard. In 1854 Professor Vaughan, when criticizing Dr. Pusey's strictures on the influence of Professors in Universities, took occasion to taunt him with his change of opinion since 1828¹. It may suffice here to quote from Pusey's reply the following striking passage:—

'The most startling and instructive fact was that the reign of Rationalism was not the direct triumph of unbelief, but the result of the decay of belief. The Rationalists, as they existed at last, were the lineal descendants, not of the assailants of Christianity, but of its defenders. Translations of our English Apologists had but aggravated the evil.

'Such was the appalling picture which met me on my first acquaintance with German theology, at the age of twenty-five, and which determined my whole subsequent life. I could not but see some things in England which corresponded in their degree to that former condition of Germany. I could not help owning a certain stiffness

¹ 'Oxford Reform and Oxford Professors,' by H. H. Vaughan, pp. 72-80. London, J. W. Parker, 1854.

among some who maintained what I believed to be the truth; one-sidedness in those who corresponded with the Pietists. I saw weak points in our Apologetic writers, and it was alarming to see, as a fact, that they had been arrayed against the infidel writers, and had failed, or had even aggravated the evil. I felt that, as to the Old Testament especially, we were not (in 1825) as yet prepared for the conflict with Rationalism. Neither the strict traditional school of Luther, nor the Pietists, who in their first origin had so remarkably resembled our "Evangelicals," had been able to stand against unbelief. Liberalism had been the child of Pietism. Being only twenty-seven (and as yet a layman) when I wrote my "Enquiry" into the causes of German Rationalism, I did not venture to speak more plainly. I hoped that the picture might speak for itself to the hearts and minds of those whom I wished to see awakened to threatened danger.

'And now, having nearly reached twice that age, although I have since seen, by God's mercy, some things which I did not then see clearly, I still think that the picture which I drew, and the causes which I assigned of German Rationalism, were in the main correct¹.'

Again, in 1862, he practically gave the same answer to the Rev. A. S. Farrar, now Professor at Durham, who, while writing the preface to his Bampton Lectures, asked Pusey what was his present estimate of the questions which had been debated between himself and Mr. Rose. He went on to say:—

'I very likely expressed myself badly or vaguely, but I never in the least rationalized. I only looked that the end for which God allowed that quenching of faith through Rationalism was that they might throw off the slough of that stiff Lutheranism and contracted Pietism by a fresher, more living faith, the faith of the Creeds.

'But I was dissatisfied with my books, and withdrew from circulation what remained of them. I have scarcely looked at either for thirty years; except that I remember that for the second I used books on the state of Germany scarce even in Germany. I forget both: but long ago retracted something said on inspiration.

'I should be glad, as you say, that you should quote them for facts only. . . .

'I have seen it stated by Rationalizers that I was then rationalizing. The Cambridge Rationalist party took up my book against Rose. I may, as I said, have expressed myself vaguely, inaccurately. But, in God's mercy, none of the unbelief which I studied ever affected me as to any one article of faith. I was ordained soon after the publication of my first book, believing all which I had been taught—the Catholic

¹ 'Collegiate and Professorial Teaching and Discipline: in answer to Professor Vaughan's strictures,' by Rev. E. B. Pusey, D.D., pp. 53, 54.

faith. I write this because you write of my "present standpoint." As far as the Rationalist controversy goes it was the same then. My sympathies were with the restoring school.'

It was natural that the controversies which followed on the publication of 'Essays and Reviews' should recall attention to books, portions of which might apparently be claimed as supporting the school to which Dr. Pusey was so earnestly opposed. He therefore expressed himself to the same effect as in the preceding quotation in a letter to the Rev. George Williams, which was printed in the *Guardian* of Feb. 4, 1863, and also in the preface to his 'Lectures on Daniel' (second edition, p. xxvi).

To the last, however, he felt anxious as to the untoward influence, as he called it, of these books. In his will, dated Nov. 19, 1875, he desires that 'the two books on the theology of Germany should not be republished.'

The following letters, dated a year before Mr. Rose's death, are the last words on the controversy, so far as it was personal between the two writers; they also illustrate with perfect clearness the position which Pusey had, from the first, intended to take up:—

REV. H. J. ROSE TO E. B. P.

March 14, 1838.

Most heartily do I wish that we had known each other personally before that German war, and I am sure it would never have taken place. I should have profited by your very far superior knowledge of the subject, and should have done the work of warning the English student more effectually—a work which you would have rejoiced to see done as much as I could. That was the real point of consequence. It was in some degree gained, but not wholly.

E. B. P. TO REV. J. H. ROSE.

[March, 1838.]

MY DEAR FRIEND,

I thank you most truly for your kind words about our 'German war,' which I too have long regretted; and the more, since, though I thought at the time your blows were the heavier, I (which at the time I did not think) commenced it. It had indeed not taken place, had we known each other then; but I thought you attached an undue weight to things external—I mean, to the authority (as distinct from the inward life) of the Church,—of its Articles and its Liturgy. And myself did

not sufficiently realize the blessing attending on our own Church, as distinct from other reformed bodies ; nor had observed the Providence which has watched over her ; or the way in which (as distinct from any 'binding force') our primitive Liturgy must have supported the faith of many who, in the last century, were probably far from entering into its full meaning, but of themselves would have sunk far lower. I thought again that you laid too much stress on the 'binding force' of Creeds and Articles ; and myself did not sufficiently appreciate the inward power of Creeds in moulding the mind, and keeping it from straying. Such, at least, is my impression, though it is now long since I have looked into what we wrote.

But this is past and gone. The most grievous part, as you say, is that the work was but half done ; and, what is for me the saddest, that I have been thought (though I protested against it in the second volume) to have been opposed to you, where I felt altogether with you, as to Rationalism itself. I thought we differed about the causes and extent of it, not, for a moment, as to its perniciousness and shallowness ; and I feared people in England were verging towards [it] in a way which I thought you did not see. I feared lest cold dry views on the one hand, and especially a decayed Pietism on the other, might find their parallel among us, and bring in Rationalism here also. We ought to have been fighting side by side, instead of with each other ; *you*, against the impugnors of Church Discipline, Subscription, Authority, which, in those quiet days in Oxford, *I* did not even know of ; *you*, upholding Creeds, and *I*, opposing 'human systems' (as distinct from Creeds, and indeed, as I have since seen more distinctly, opposed to their very $\eta\theta\omicron\varsigma$). However, I trust that we were even then friends in heart. (I grieved at the time when I heard of your ill health, which the worry of this controversy must have aggravated.) And, since 'precious are the wounds of a friend,' our mutual blows may have done us each good ; and any hastiness, I trust [has] been forgiven by Him Whom we both meant to serve.

CHAPTER IX.

RETURN TO OXFORD—DEATH OF HEBREW PROFESSOR—
APPOINTMENT TO PROFESSORSHIP—ORDINATION TO
THE PRIESTHOOD—INSTALLATION AS CANON.

1828.

PUSEY had returned from his wedding tour with the intention of settling in Oxford as a student of theology who had not yet found, but might reasonably expect to find, some definite occupation. With this view he had taken a house¹ in Broad Street on a year's lease; but it was almost at once surrendered to make way for Dr. Wootton, who was engaged to be married, and wished to settle immediately. Pusey was thus, as he expressed it, 'on the pavement.' Nothing was settled beyond the month's visit to Bishop Lloyd. If he could not get another house in Oxford, it was apprehended by Mrs. Pusey's relations that the young people 'would go to some German University, and then good-bye to them, for he would never know when to come back again.' This apprehension was not altogether groundless. Four months before his marriage Edward Pusey, when writing to Miss Barker on the difficulty of getting a house in Oxford, had suggested that 'if we cannot get a nice house at an English University, we must, I suppose, at a German one; and Bonn is much prettier, more learned, though not perhaps so "proud," as Oxford.'

However, for the time being Mr. and Mrs. Pusey were the guests of Bishop Lloyd at Christ Church. They occupied the lodgings² which belonged to the Bishop as Canon and Regius Professor of Divinity. The Bishop

¹ This house since 1847 has been well known to all residents in Oxford as that of Sir Henry W. Acland, the Regius Professor of Medicine.

² The Regius Professor of Divinity at that date lived in the south-east

corner of the Great Quadrangle, close to the Hall staircase. These lodgings were exchanged for others on the north side of the quadrangle during the Professorship of Dr. Mozley, after the death of Dr. Jelf.

himself was living at Cuddesdon; he used to ride into Oxford to give his lectures. He reserved one room in the house for his books and pupils, and placed the other apartments at the disposal of his guests.

Mrs. Pusey's brief journal enables us to follow the newly-married couple in this their first joint experience of Oxford. The day after they arrived they visited Pusey's rooms at Jesus, Mrs. Pusey being introduced to the new Provost. The next day, Sept. 14th, was Sunday,—the twenty-eighth anniversary of Edward Pusey's baptism. They went twice to St. Mary's, where Newman had lately entered on his duties as successor to the Provost of Oriel. Mrs. Pusey mentions the sermons as being preached by Dr. Whately, the Principal of St. Alban Hall. On the following Thursday Mrs. Pusey and Mrs. Whately and Mr. Newman called upon Mr. Pusey. Among their friends whose visits were alluded to were Mr.¹ and Mrs. Burton, Dr. and Mrs. Buckland, Mr. Dornford, Mr. Vaughan Thomas, the Provost of Oriel, Mr. Mills of Magdalen, Mr. R. I. Wilberforce, Sir Walter Russell, Mr. Acland, Mr. J. G. Copleston, the Warden of All Souls, and Blanco White. They had several small dinner parties of four or five persons, and must have made a very fair acquaintance with Oxford society. Pusey took his wife about Oxford as if they were visiting a foreign town; and she records her impressions. The casts of statues in the Bodleian Library, the chapel of All Souls, the altarpiece of Magdalen, seem to have interested her particularly; but she was still more preoccupied with Bishop Heber's portrait in the chapel of All Souls, doubtless by reason of her daily study of the Bishop's Journal. For under her husband's direction Mrs. Pusey was reading a great deal and reading it carefully. Her attention was at this time divided between Latin authors, in particular Tacitus and Sallust, whom she could read easily in the original, Whately's 'Logic,' and Kent's 'History of the British Admirals,'—a work which kept alive in some sense satisfied an old enthusiasm about the navy. Among religious works she was studying Chandler's

¹ Afterwards Regius Professor of Divinity.

Bampton Lectures, Bloomfield on St. John, Whately's 'Essays on the Difficulties of St. Paul,' Bishop Heber's Journal, and especially the sermons of Theremin, whose preaching had interested her husband when in Germany. Theremin occupied an intermediate position between the Pietists as represented by Reinhard, and the older Lutheranism; and his influence at Berlin and in Germany was at this time considerable. He died in 1846 full of honours, a member of the Consistory, Professor in the University, and preacher at the Court and in the Cathedral.

But meanwhile an event had occurred which was, as it proved, to determine Pusey's home and work for the remaining fifty-four years of his life. On September 25th, 1828, Dr. Alexander Nicoll, Regius Professor of Hebrew, died at the early age of thirty-five. He had come up to Balliol College as a Scotch Exhibitioner; he had only obtained a Second Class in the Schools, but he had early displayed an original capacity for languages, both Scandinavian and Eastern, which led to his being made, at the age of twenty-one, Sub-Librarian in the Bodleian Library. To the astonishment of the University, and still more to his own astonishment¹, on the vacancy created by the elevation of Dr. Laurence to the Archbishopric of Cashel, he was in 1822 appointed by Lord Liverpool to the Chair of Hebrew. Always a hardworking, patient, accurate student, he carried into his new office the formed habits of earnest study which had marked him out for it; and the premature close of a career that promised rare philological distinction was partly hastened by excessive devotion to his duties. His successor always spoke of his 'removal from among us as a wellnigh irreparable loss to sacred scholarship'; Nicoll's self-depreciation, simplicity, candour, and self-denial had won Pusey's heart². These qualities were not unconnected

¹ The story in Cox's 'Recollections,' p. 158, is contradicted in Nicoll's 'Sermons,' pref. p. xxxi.

² Bib. Bod. Cod. MSS. Orient. Cat., pt. 2, vol. 2, praef. p. iii: 'Propriam suam nihili, alienam verò existimationem sibi semper habuit carissimam.'

Ibid.: 'Ab iis omnibus defletus qui candidum ejus animum, summam modestiam, benevolentiam singularem suique abnegantem propius inspexerant; mihi vero tanto magis quantò pluribus ei devinctus essem beneficiis.'

with his remarkable accuracy as a scholar¹,—the distinction on which Pusey would insist when conversing with his own pupils in later years. Assuredly the modesty, courtesy, and blamelessness of life, which are commemorated on Nicoll's tomb in Christ Church, were far from being flowers of monumental rhetoric; they are attested by all who knew him².

To Pusey Dr. Nicoll's loss was a very serious one. 'He was the only person here,'—so Pusey writes to Mr. R. I. Wilberforce,—'whom I could consult on our common pursuits, in which he could give me so much assistance. His loss will be felt more on the continent than in England.'

Speculation was at once rife as to Dr. Nicoll's successor. Dr. Wyndham Knatchbull, the Laudian Professor of Arabic and a Fellow of All Souls; the Rev. B. P. Symons, Subwarden and Tutor of Wadham College; Mr. Forshall, Keeper of the Manuscripts in the British Museum, and formerly Fellow of Exeter College, together with Dr. Vansittart and Mr. Marsh, were mentioned in Oxford as possible objects of the favour of the Prime Minister. Of these names Mr. Forshall's was supposed to represent the widest scholarship: his knowledge of Oriental manuscripts and in particular his reputation as a Syriac scholar were much insisted on. He himself applied to the Duke of Wellington and to the Archbishop of Canterbury, expressing his readiness to be entrusted with the work of finishing Dr. Nicoll's Catalogue of the Arabic Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library and of preparing another of the Hebrew and Syriac manuscripts.

Fifteen years had passed since the date of Archbishop Howley's leaving Oxford; and he may have been imper-

¹ Cf. Bib. Bod. Cod. MSS. Orient. Cat., pt. 2, vol. 2, praef. p. iii, where illustrations of this in his work at the Arabic Catalogue are instanced: e.g. 'se nullam ne literam quidem vocalem neque Djezm neque Teshdid de suo addidisse verum MSS. ubique religiosè exscripsisse.'

² See e.g. Cox's 'Recollections,' p. 158. The inscription in Christ Church Cathedral runs thus: 'Vir multarum Europae Asiaeque linguarum clarus, sacrarum literarum quas sedulò excoluit, peritiam, modestiâ, comitate atque innocentia vitae cumulavit.'

fectly informed as to the state of Hebrew studies in the University. Certainly the tone of his letter to Bishop Lloyd on the subject is almost desponding.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY TO THE BISHOP
OF OXFORD.

MY DEAR LORD, Addington, Oct. 4, 1828.

The death of Dr. Nicoll places a preferment of considerable importance at the disposal of Government.

Whether the Duke of Wellington will give the preferment to the candidate who is the best qualified, or whether the University at present can furnish a man of high pretensions in this line, I do not know. And if a man is appointed with no other qualifications than knowledge of Hebrew sufficient to construe the Bible, and go over the verbs with beginners, it is very indifferent to me who has the professorship.

But if there are persons in other respects fit for the station, and distinguished as Oriental scholars, it would be a pity that the opportunity of doing credit to the University and bestowing an appropriate reward on merit should be lost. . . .

If you can give me information for or against any supposable applicants I shall of course receive it in confidence, having no other object than that of giving my opinion, if it should be required, in favour of the fittest man.

Believe me, my dear Lord,

Most truly yours,

W. CANTUAR.

Of the feeling in the University, the subjoined may perhaps be taken as a sample:—

REV. PROFESSOR GAISFORD TO THE BISHOP OF OXFORD.

MY DEAR BISHOP, Iford, Oct. 6, 1828.

I feel very deeply the loss we have sustained in poor Nicoll. He has left a gap in the University which cannot, as far as I see, be filled up. I thought ill of him when I left you in May last, but did not apprehend that his end would have been so rapid.

If we cannot have so able a man to replace him as we could wish, I hope they will find us some one who shall be harmless. . . .

Yours truly,

T. GAISFORD.

But a less keen and far-sighted person than Bishop Lloyd would not have waited for the advice of correspondents before taking his own measures with respect to

a matter of such serious importance to the University and the Church. It is highly probable that the Bishop had made up his mind at once on hearing that the Hebrew Chair was vacant. Mrs. Edward Pusey's diary shows that her husband and the Bishop were constantly meeting : thus they breakfasted together on Sept. 28th ; the Bishop called on the 30th, and so on. Pusey used to say that one day Bishop Lloyd made a private incursion into his study, spent some time in examining the Hebrew and Arabic papers on which he was at work, and thus finally decided on submitting the writer's name to the Duke of Wellington. At the same time he advised Pusey to write to influential personal friends, stating his qualifications for the office. Pusey wrote accordingly, at the Bishop's direction, to Lord Colchester, Archdeacon Cambridge, and the Rev. R. I. Wilberforce. What he felt, he well describes to Wilberforce :—

'It would be a splendid field for exertion : it would give me an opportunity for active employment, without sacrificing theology, which I have so long wished for ; and for promoting the study of the original language of the Old Testament, whose neglect I have so long regretted. I am not therefore without hopes, for I should not dare to hope, I should hope against myself, unless I thought myself better fitted for the office than my competitors.'

Pusey's unstinted devotion to Oriental studies for several years had undoubtedly made him feel that he was qualified for the vacant post ; and any fear that he might be guilty of undue ambition, had been set at rest by the decisive judgment and injunction of one whose position and character appeared to deserve unhesitating deference.

The Bishop's only hesitation was caused by Pusey's first book on the Theology of Germany. This had been in circulation for four months, and already adverse interpretations of its language were current. For instance, Archdeacon Cambridge, replying to Pusey's letter, mentioned that some dignitaries thought him 'latitudinarian,' although he himself acquitted Pusey of the charge. The Bishop, having referred to these criticisms, received in

reply a candid statement of Pusey's theological position on the chief points on which he thought exception might be taken—Inspiration, Original sin, and the Procession of the Holy Ghost. The passage on the first point is of sufficient importance to be quoted in full. It is an independent restatement of his thoughts on the subject before his book had been openly challenged. In spite of some defects, nothing can exceed the emphasis with which he asserts a strong theory of the Inspiration of Scripture. The letter concludes with a brief account of the writer's ecclesiastical position.

E. B. P. TO THE BISHOP OF OXFORD.

[Christ Church], Oct. 6, 1828.

On the doctrine of Inspiration. I do not *essentially* differ from those who regard it as dictation, and I should come to entirely the same result with those who, as yourself, suppose a preventive superintendence: the mode however in which I should conceive it is that of the communication of religious knowledge (or rather of that knowledge necessary for the propagation and maintenance of religion) once for all.

To explain myself by an instance: I should suppose that St. Paul before he wrote the Epistle to the Romans must have frequently taught and written on the great points of doctrine contained in it: that he had spoken of them, not as a mere machine, but as one whose understanding was enlightened to understand their height and depth; and that consequently when he came again to write upon them there was no necessity for any second illumination, but that he wrote upon them as upon subjects which he had been by these original communications enabled thoroughly to understand, and in which consequently he could be liable to no error.

I have perhaps scarcely sufficiently explained myself, but I do not thereby abate the slightest tittle of the authority of any syllable in the Scriptures.

I differ only in the mode of deriving that authority, in which I think that which I adopt (I hope you will not deem arrogantly) adheres closer to Scripture.

With regard to the Historical Books (about which Mr. R[ose]'s friends attack me, though I have not said one syllable about it), I should think it amounted to the communication of such an insight into the objects of the two revelations as guided the writers to the selection of those facts whose transmission was important for those objects in each. In the New Testament it must of course be extended to the bringing back to the remembrance those discourses of our Saviour,

whose preservation was especially necessary, and which have been preserved.

Prophecy of course stands by itself. . . .

Upon practical subjects, as my habits have removed me from those occupations which press them upon one's mind, I can say very little, except that I believe that, practically, my opinions are the same as those of the High Church; that, however I may respect individuals, I feel myself more and more removed from what is called the Low Church; and that it has been my object (not certainly on any secular grounds, but because I think that its predominance and final prevalence would be most beneficial to the Church) to remain in that body which I most respected and valued.

As you dwelt on what I said of Spener, I may add that I should have thought very differently of him had it not been his object to prevent any disunion in the Church, and had he not opposed it with all his power whenever there seemed to be any ground to apprehend it.

I will just add that I do not know any subject of controversy between the High and the Low Church in which I do not agree with the former: but neither do I know any one upon which I should be likely to preach.

I scarcely know whether you may not think this statement very superfluous, and I fear perhaps encroaching on your time; yet though I believe you have known for some years the principal points, I thought anything preferable to running the risk of committing you by recommending me without candidly stating what my opinions were.

Before Saturday I had not thought that there was any difference between my creed and that of him we have lost.

Perhaps the whole letter (as is the case with other of Pusey's early opinions) may without injustice be considered one of many instances in the controversies of the Church, where men of genius or position attempt to pronounce off-hand on theological questions, the depths of which they have not attempted to explore. Doubtless in Bishop Lloyd's eyes the real value of the letter consisted less in its particular statements than in its generally positive drift; he was satisfied that Pusey—though, as Newman had graphically described¹, his mind did not move in exactly conventional lines—was quite unlikely to cause serious anxiety on the score of rationalism or even latitudinarianism.

¹ See note on p. 164.

There is no doubt that Pusey was anxious to obtain the Chair: he was alternately hopeful and despondent about his success. He heard from Archdeacon Cambridge, who enclosed an encouraging note from the Archbishop of Canterbury. Bishop Lloyd had written to the Primate, strongly pressing Pusey's claims; and this had not been without its effect. 'But my spirits,' Pusey writes, 'rather sink with every day of suspense. However, I think very little about it except at letter-time.' On Nov. 12th the visit to Bishop Lloyd's lodgings in Christ Church came to an end, and Pusey and his wife went to Pusey to visit Lady Lucy. Philip Pusey had gone abroad for two years, and had lent his home to his widowed mother.

But Nov. 12th—the day of their migration from Oxford to Pusey, in great uncertainty as to their future life—was also the date of an important letter on the part of the Prime Minister. The Duke of Wellington wrote to Sir W. Knighton:—

‘Nov. 12, 1828.

‘As it gives the King so much pain to write, I beg you to take His Majesty's pleasure upon the appointment of the Rev. Mr. Pusey to be Regius Professor of Hebrew at the University of Oxford. He is strongly recommended by the Heads of the Church, and by all those capable of forming an opinion of the qualifications of the individual who ought to be appointed to fill that office¹’

The King must have replied immediately, since on Nov. 14th the Duke of Wellington's letter, offering Pusey the Hebrew Professorship, reached Oxford.

THE DUKE OF WELLINGTON TO THE REV. E. B. PUSEY.

SIR,

London, Nov. 13, 1828.

I have the honor to inform you that His Majesty has been graciously pleased to approve of your being appointed Regius Professor of Hebrew at Oxford.

I have the honor, &c.

Rev. E. B. Pusey.

WELLINGTON.

This letter was of course sent to Oriel College, where

¹ This extract is inserted by the kindness of the present Sir W. Knighton.

William Pusey had just begun to reside as an undergraduate. He took the letter to Newman, who was his tutor, and who, at his request, opened it, and then gave him leave to ride over to Pusey with it. By the same post Bishop Lloyd was informed that his exertions had been successful. 'What will Pusey do?' said a clergyman who was staying at Cuddesdon. 'If,' said the Bishop, 'he belongs to the old school, he will come over and see me: if to the new, he will write me a letter.' On his brother's arrival at Pusey, the carriage was at once ordered, and Pusey drove over to Cuddesdon with his wife to thank Bishop Lloyd for an appointment which was, as he knew, so largely due to the Bishop's judgment and exertions. He then returned to Oxford and wrote to the Prime Minister:—

REV. E. B. PUSEY TO THE DUKE OF WELLINGTON.

MY LORD DUKE, Oriental College, Nov. 14, [1828].

I have this morning had the honor of receiving your Grace's letter informing me that His Majesty has been graciously pleased to approve of my being appointed to the Regius Professorship of Divinity in this University.

May I take leave to beg your Grace to convey to His Majesty my acknowledgments of this distinguished favour, in such terms as may appear to your Grace most adequately to express the deepest sense of gratitude?

To your Grace I am at a loss for words to express my obligations for your exceeding kindness in recommending me to His Majesty for this important office—an office which comprises everything which I wished, and more than I ought to have hoped for. I will only say that I will endeavour to show my gratitude to your Grace by a sincere and earnest devotion to the duties of the office, which I owe entirely to your goodness.

With the greatest respect,

I have the honor to remain

Your Grace's obliged and obedient servant,

E. B. PUSEY.

It will be observed that Pusey describes himself as appointed Regius Professor of Divinity. This inaccuracy on such an occasion, and in so brief a letter, though probably owing to a slip of the pen in a moment of excitement, is not without significance. It shows how, in his conception

of the office he was undertaking, the theological interests were already uppermost, even though he was keenly alive to its literary or philological aspects ; it explains why he regarded his work in the Tractarian movement as quite germane to the duties of his chair ; it anticipates his earnest remonstrances with the Vice-Chancellor in 1853 when, to his great annoyance, he was classed among the Professors of Languages. The mistake does not appear to have been noticed : the letter is docketed as a 'grateful acceptance' of 'the Regius Professorship of Hebrew by the Rev. E. B. Pusey.'

One of the persons who had expected the post wrote to the Duke of Wellington to remonstrate with him for appointing 'a relation of that great Radical, Lord Radnor,' while overlooking the claims of a sound Tory. 'I appointed Mr. Pusey,' replied the Duke, 'because I have reason to believe that he is the best scholar.'

Later in the day on which he wrote to the Prime Minister, Pusey wrote to the Bishop of Oxford, and with characteristic generosity offered to buy all the library and furniture of the late Professor, if his widow wished to part with them.

Pusey's offer was accepted. The bookshelves which remained in his small study to the end of his life were those which had been placed there by his predecessor. As was natural, many of Dr. Nicoll's books were duplicates of his own.

'I fear,' he writes again to Bishop Lloyd, 'that I have almost got into a scrape about the books, as I have already many of the most expensive, and the number seems much larger than I had expected. If, however, the sum does not exceed £500 or £600 I should be most glad to relieve Mrs. Nicoll from all anxiety.'

In the end he bought all Dr. Nicoll's books, and sold, of course at a loss, those of them which he did not want.

The appointment seems to have been generally received with expressions of warm satisfaction. The Dean of Christ Church, Dr. Smith, wrote a very friendly letter of welcome to the new member of his Chapter ; and this was only one

of many 'very gratifying congratulations' which poured in upon the new Professor from his Oxford friends. Nor were his more recent friends in Germany backward to express their satisfaction. Of the foreign congratulations which remain, that of Dr. Lücke was simple and hearty, while Freytag did not disguise his warm satisfaction at the prospect of securing in Pusey a useful coadjutor at Oxford. 'Nicoll's death,' he wrote, 'has been a great sorrow to me: what a comfort it is that you are to succeed him!' Pusey himself in later years always dwelt with a certain satisfaction on the fact that he owed his appointment to the favour of the Crown. He was fond of resolving the Latin epithet 'Regius,' which distinguished his Chair, into its English equivalent. He had been presented to George IV., he used to say, as 'Your Majesty's Professor of Hebrew.' When at the close of his life he subscribed to a testimonial offered to Prince Leopold on his marriage, he signed himself Her Majesty's Professor of Hebrew. This trait was not accidental. In his most Liberal days as a young man, the old feeling of personal devotion to the sovereign remained, and it strengthened with his advancing years.

At the date of his appointment to the Professorship, Pusey was only in deacon's orders. The Hebrew Chair being attached to a canonry of Christ Church, he had to be ordained Priest before he could occupy his stall. In those days the bishops were wont to insist less upon the Ember seasons than is, happily, the case now; and it was thought desirable that the ordination should be hastened as much as possible. The nine days which elapsed between Pusey's appointment and his ordination as Priest were spent in retirement at his old home.

On Sunday, November 23, 1828, being the twenty-fifth Sunday after Trinity, Edward Pusey was ordained Priest by Bishop Lloyd in the parish church of Cuddesdon. On Saturday, the 22nd, he and his wife drove from Pusey to the Palace at Cuddesdon for the ordination on the following day. No one else was ordained, and the service was of the simplest character: the only music was the singing of


Brady and Tate's psalms by the rude village choir of that day. Four persons only witnessed the scene, besides the villagers and the Bishop's own family. The Rev. Edward Burton, of Christ Church, Examining Chaplain to the Bishop, and his successor as Regius Professor of Divinity, was present in his official capacity. In order to take part in the service he must have examined Pusey; but the examination, of which no record has been preserved, was probably of a formal character. Another witness was Pusey's old and dearly-loved tutor, the Rev. T. Vowler Short, Student of Christ Church, who died Bishop of St. Asaph. Besides these were two Students of Christ Church—the Rev. Augustus Page Saunders, at that time Curate of Cuddesdon, but subsequently Head Master of the Charterhouse and Dean of Peterborough, and the Hon. John Chetwynd Talbot.

Few of the village churches in England have witnessed so many interesting scenes, or have echoed to the voices of so many remarkable men, as the parish church of All Saints, Cuddesdon. During the episcopate of Bishop Wilberforce there were few men eminent for learning, or work, or character in the Church of England who did not, under the spell of his genius and sympathy, find themselves at some time ministering or worshipping within its walls; and to many hundreds of the clergy that old Norman tower-arch and that narrow chancel are associated with the most solemn experiences of their life. But it may be safely asserted that no event, in itself or in its consequences, more momentous, more pregnant with influences far-reaching and incalculable, has ever taken place within those walls than was enacted on that dark Sunday in November when Charles Lloyd, Bishop of Oxford, conferred the order of Priesthood upon Edward Bouverie Pusey.

On Monday, November 24th, Pusey and his wife returned to Pusey, through Oxford, where they spent the greater part of the day. Bishop Lloyd had advised him to lose no time in setting to work on Nicoll's unfinished Catalogue of the Arabic Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library. On his

way through Oxford Pusey possessed himself of all Nicoll's papers bearing on the subject, and on the following morning he set to work on them.

On Tuesday, December 9th, he was installed in the Cathedral as Canon of Christ Church. On Sunday, December 14th, he first attended the morning and evening service in Christ Church as one of the Canons ; and on the



ALL SAINTS' CHURCH, PUSEY.

following day he returned to Pusey to spend Christmas there. This Christmas Day was always remembered as an anniversary in Pusey's later years. On that day he 'took the whole duty at Pusey Church,' celebrating the Holy Communion for the first time in the church where he was baptized. He preached on Phil. iv. 4, 'Rejoice in the Lord alway : and again I say, Rejoice'—one of the sentences of St. Paul which were dearest to him throughout his life, and which he would repeat to himself, again and again

when ill, in his last years. The sermon follows the guidance of the text; it is an invitation to holy Christian joy in view of the blessings of Redemption. The language about immortality seems to be coloured by the recollection that within a few yards of the preacher lay his father's body. The sermon concludes with an invitation to receive the Holy Sacrament, which he describes as 'that means by which in a more especial manner, as the Apostle tells us, we become partakers of the Body of Christ.' 'That Body,' he adds, 'which was broken for you, is now before you.' He afterwards speaks of 'partaking of the symbols of Christ's sufferings.' This sermon foreshadows very definitely his later Eucharistic teaching.

On the following Sunday, December 28th, being Holy Innocents' Day, he again took the whole service in Pusey Church, and christened an infant after the afternoon prayers. At the morning service he preached on Phil. ii. 3, 'In lowliness of mind let each esteem other better than himself.'

The rest of the vacation, with the exception of a three days' visit to Fairford, was spent quietly at his old home, Pusey occasionally taking part in the services and preaching. On January 12, 1829, he and his wife took up their abode in their own house at Oxford.



DR. PUSEY'S LODGINGS IN CHRIST CHURCH.

(From the Tom Quadrangle.)

CHAPTER X.

IN RESIDENCE AT CHRIST CHURCH—COMMENCEMENT OF HEBREW LECTURES — ELECTION OF 1829 — DEATH OF BISHOP LLOYD — ARABIC CATALOGUE — OXFORD SOCIETY IN 1830—SEVERE ILLNESS—SANSKRIT PROFESSORSHIP—PUSEY AND ELLERTON SCHOLARSHIPS —INFIDEL LECTURES—BRITISH ASSOCIATION—FIRST UNIVERSITY SERMON—DEATH OF YOUNGEST CHILD—
'REMARKS ON CATHEDRAL INSTITUTIONS.'

1829-1832.

ON coming into residence at Christ Church Pusey found himself in a society curiously unlike that with which the present generation is familiar. Dean Smith had been at the head of it since 1824; two years were yet to pass before he exchanged it for a golden prebend at Durham. At the head of the canons was the venerable Sub-dean, Dr. Barnes; while amongst them were Bishop Lloyd and Dr. William Buckland, lately appointed, who was nursing the young science of Geology. Archdeacon Pett, whose vigorous common-sense features are still conspicuous in

the portrait in Christ Church Hall, was the man of business who generally appears in every Chapter ; he found time to administer the estates of Christ Church as well as the archdeaconry of Oxford. The names of Hay, Dowdeswell, and Woodcock have already passed out of public memory. Only two of the canonries were at that date connected with professorships.

The new Professor and his wife were generally welcome in the cultivated but narrow social circle of the old Hebdomadal Oxford. Mrs. Pusey had a great deal of work to do in the way of calling and receiving visitors, and kept a tolerably complete record of these transactions. She was, at this time, of striking appearance, handsome and handsomely dressed. Their domestic establishment was well-appointed ; it was in their carriage and pair that Pusey, who had a reputation for being a good whip¹, drove his wife when exploring the neighbourhood of Oxford and returning visits.

Amidst all his social engagements and duties, Pusey was evidently looking forward with natural anxiety to his first lecture as Professor of Hebrew. He had been, as might be expected, endeavouring to decide upon the best plan for making his professorial lectures useful, and had written to Newman on the subject. In the subjoined letter he acknowledges Newman's reply, and states the difficulties with which he had to grapple :—

E. B. P. TO REV. J. H. NEWMAN.

Pusey House, Saturday even., Jan. 10, [1829].

Your opinion of my lectures (i.e. as relates to beginners) is precisely what I had myself felt ; my difficulty was *how much*, not whether *any*, or *much*, ought to be omitted. It was always my own theory that as little grammar as possible should be taught at first, i. e. until the student is sufficiently familiar with the language to take interest in the instances, &c., and the general structure of a language

¹ This, however, did not prevent occasional catastrophes. When an undergraduate at Christ Church in 1847, the present writer was told by Dr. Barnes that he had seen Dr. and

Mrs. Pusey upset in their carriage on the Abingdon Road—a misfortune which he attributed to 'Pusey's way of thinking about other things.'

so different from our own—until, in fact, he be in some degree acquainted from his own experience with the problems which are to be solved. I fear much that I shall not have such a class as this: the question then is, what is the minimum both of principles and details which can be presented to them, at once to prepare them to judge of these languages by themselves, to put them in possession of some of the principal points which they are to bear in mind, and to find enough in some measure to employ the more active without disgusting those who have either less leisure or less patience. Yet, on the other hand, it seems to me more and more difficult to teach the language in any degree philosophically without entering into a considerable detail of principles, which in the earlier parts, on the formation of words, forms, &c., cannot be done without being very abstract, and consequently very dry. Again, unless one teaches them more than the common matter of fact which is to be found in grammars, the lectures will be (as were, at first at least, those of poor N.'s in grammar) thought to be of little use.

I had thought a good deal and indeed intended to adopt the plan of using a Hebrew Grammar (Lee's or Stuart's) as a text-book. I fear, however, that there will be some difficulty in putting this in practice, because that which I have compiled is on too different a plan to be easily conformed to either: something however of this I hope to be able to do, at least to select the portions of Lee's Grammar which should be read previous to each lecture, and criticize this as far as I may venture, but without binding myself down to mere criticism or illustration.

The result of all this is that I am much more perplexed than is at all pleasant just before the commencement of my lectures. Lecture however I must, and, if I lose ground at first, must do my best hereafter to regain it. . . .

I saw J. K[eble] twice at Fairford. I am glad to say that he was looking very well, though he said he was obliged to take care of himself, and declined dining out to meet me. Yet I never saw him, as I thought, looking better.

After his judgment had been matured by five years' experience of teaching Hebrew, he wrote as follows:—

E. B. P. TO REV. W. DALBY.

Ch. Ch., Feb. 25, 1834.

. . . As to the method of reading, what I have found best to answer is, (1) to read *at first* nothing of grammar but what is absolutely necessary: as soon as a person knows the regular grammatical inflexions he should begin to read. Grammar at a later period is much more improving, for it cannot be well understood until something of the language be practically known: it then becomes interesting. (2) In reading the Bible, to become thoroughly acquainted with the meaning

of the words in each portion which is read, not troubling one's-self with any meaning a word may have in any other place. A verse should at first be read two or three times, but a person at the end should wish to know nothing but the verse. (3) Read loud. (4) For a long time read no criticisms or commentators—read Hebrew and not about Hebrew. (5) Read the easiest Hebrew (the historical books) for a long time before attempting the more difficult.

You will easily see what mistakes the above rules are intended to guard against. I believe the great source of disappointment in learning Hebrew is that persons are too impatient (it is a very natural eagerness) to turn their Hebrew knowledge to account: but it is of course all wasted time and energy. Persons must submit to learn as children, and go to work patiently and humbly, if they would ever reap the fruit. I would anxiously deprecate an empirical or superficial study, but this is a different thing from recommending the observation of strict method in study, and postponing difficulties which in many cases are only such because the individual comes to them unprepared to encounter them. . . .

Every one, I am sure, who has made advance enough to understand and use the Psalms in the original, has had reason to bless God for having put it into his mind to commence the study. No part of my Hebrew knowledge repays me like this. They are indeed green pastures after one has been tormented with the perverseness of human criticism.

I would gladly have written more but that I am leaving Oxford in search of health, and in good hopes that it may please God that I should lecture again next term, which I have not been obliged to intermit for the last three years. I would have sent you also a little tract on the 'Fasts of the Church' but that I know not of a ready conveyance.

He had intended to begin his lectures on January 25th; he actually began on Tuesday, February 3rd. This date—like those of all the leading events in his life—was always kept in his memory. 'This time fifty years ago,' he said on the anniversary in 1879, 'I began to lecture as Regius Professor of Hebrew.' With Pusey these dates were no mere reminiscences; they were remembered so well because each anniversary suggested prayer or praise to the Author of all goodness, Whose hand was reverently recognized in every dispensation, whether of success or failure, of sorrow or joy.

He began with two sets of lectures, one of an elementary character on Genesis, and one for more advanced students

on Isaiah. Fifty men came to the first lecture on Genesis. Among those present were G. Moberly, Frederick Oakeley, H. Bulteel, W. Trower, G. A. Denison, C. P. Golightly, J. James, and R. Hussey. Only four students came to the Isaiah lecture; of these were R. I. Wilberforce, of Oriel, and A. P. Saunders, of Christ Church. Writing to Tholuck somewhat later Pusey says:—

‘My office is of the greatest interest to me: it is everything that I could wish. I found about fifty who were willing to begin the elements, but four only for my lecture on Isaiah. I need not say how glad I shall be to receive any one recommended by you: if I can induce any promising theologians to visit Germany I will avail myself of your permission to recommend them to you.’

But the course of study at Oxford is liable to interruptions; and an interruption of some seriousness was imminent. Sir Robert Peel had represented the University of Oxford in the House of Commons since 1817, and, from the date of Mr. Estcourt’s election in 1826, he had been the senior Burgess. Sir Robert Peel had been for many years a consistent opponent of Roman Catholic Emancipation; session after session he had distinguished himself by eloquent speeches in which he denounced it as fraught with ruin to the best interests of the empire. But O’Connell’s return for the county of Clare in 1828 had brought matters to a crisis. In opening the session of 1829 a measure of relief was announced in the King’s Speech; and when on February 5th the Oxford Convocation voted a petition against the Roman Catholic claims, a letter from Sir Robert Peel was read, in which he offered to resign his seat on the ground that, as a Minister, he had recommended to the King an ‘adjustment’ of those claims. The actual recommendation amounted to something more than was implied by the phrase; Peel’s resignation was acquiesced in by a majority of his constituents, and Sir R. H. Inglis was invited to fill his place. But a large minority in Convocation were unwilling to part with their distinguished representative, even when not sharing his opinions; and Sir R. Peel was persuaded to contest the

seat. The election took place on February 26th and the following day. At the close of the poll, 755 members of Convocation had voted for Inglis, and 609 for Peel.

This election divided men sharply throughout Oxford, and not least in its intellectual centre, the Oriel Common-room. Cardinal Newman has described how it led to a separation between himself and Whately. Newman had petitioned annually for Emancipation; he had voted in 1827 or 1828 against the petition of Convocation: he had no particular sympathy with the rank and file of those who supported it. But in February, 1829, he threw his weight into the scale against Peel. He thought that the Government was treating the University with scant respect; and he was also himself passing from the *clientèle* of Whately to a more intimate association with Keble and Froude.

Keble took a strong line against Peel. He issued a protest addressed to members of Convocation. It is dated Fairford, February 16, 1829. It characteristically takes the form of queries. These queries were drawn up so carefully and modestly that each of them admitted of only one answer. The most important of them, in its practical bearings, runs thus: Whether, considering all circumstances, it will not be safer and more creditable to the University to make a new choice, than to give an implied sanction to a measure which it has so recently and so earnestly deprecated upon the mere authority of any person whatever? His great anxiety was that 'the University should do nothing which might be likely to countenance the dangerous laxity of modern politics.' Peel's change recalled Sir R. Walpole: it enabled bad men 'to disparage the very idea of public virtue.' There might be an adequate explanation of it; but, as yet, no such explanation was before the University.

Keble's prominent action on this question brought him into collision with several old friends, notably with Sir John T. Coleridge, with whom he remonstrated in warm terms for joining Sir R. Peel's Committee. But Keble

had been forced, much against his will, to take a leading part; and it is not difficult to see in his letters at the time the germs of his sermon on National Apostasy, and the peculiar union of moral and intellectual qualities which made him 'the true and primary author'¹ of the Oxford Movement.

Pusey had never a moment's hesitation in supporting Sir R. Peel. His political Liberalism, as a young man, had led him to take a warm interest in the Emancipation question. He had felt, as we have seen, strongly against the Government when it was opposed to the Roman Catholic claims, and he could not but welcome its conversion. Not the least powerful motive on Pusey's mind would have been furnished by the example and influence of his friend and adviser, Bishop Lloyd. The Bishop's adhesion to the views of the Government may have been in part due to the influence of his old pupil, Mr. Peel; but he supported the Bill both by his voice and his vote when it came into the House of Lords. Pusey, like Keble, also canvassed for votes, but in the opposite interest. 'A letter from Mr. Pusey, at that time one of the most liberal members of the University, decided me to give my vote to Sir Robert Peel².' Blanco White—the writer of these words—had been on intimate terms with Pusey, but for a man in his position it required courage to follow Pusey's advice in the present matter. Blanco White, considering his position in England as a convert from the Church of Rome, was especially welcome to the most ardent opponents of Roman Catholic Emancipation. He knew full well how his action at Oxford would be received³; but he felt that he had no moral choice. He has described the cold looks which met him when he gave his vote in Convocation.

Whately, as well as Blanco White, Shuttleworth, and the Provost of Oriel, were Pusey's allies against Keble, New-

¹ Newman, 'Apologia' (ed. 1880), p. 17.

² 'Life of Joseph Blanco White,' iii. 130. Cf. *ibid.* i. 453, where Pusey is

associated with the Provost of Oriel as acting for Peel.

³ 'Life of Joseph Blanco White,' i. 455.

man¹, Hurrell Froude, and Robert Wilberforce. There were some names that became prominent in the Church movement of later years, as Bowden and Woodgate, who, like Pusey himself, as Newman used to say, began as political Liberals and became Tractarians. These were on Pusey's side. Pusey wrote to Bishop Lloyd, expressing his regret at Keble's prominent line, and in particular at his 'Queries.' 'Of course,' Pusey observes, 'every supporter of Mr. Peel must have answered the queries to his own satisfaction.' But Keble's method was Socratic; he wished if he could to disturb the satisfaction of Peel's supporters, and his success in doing this scarcely admits of question, while it explains Pusey's annoyance.

Keble was pained at finding himself in what he would have thought undutiful opposition to the Bishop, and two days before the election he begged Pusey to make the necessary explanations:—

REV. J. KEBLE, JUNR., TO E. B. P.

Fairford, 24 February, 1829.

The circumstances of this election having made my name so much more public than I could ever have expected or wished it to be on such an occasion, I cannot be quite easy without asking pardon of all Mr. Peel's friends, and especially (through you) of the Bishop of Oxford, if anything in which I have had a part may have given him a moment's pain: or if I have seemed unworthily suspicious of one for whom he must be deeply interested.

You will give me credit, I know, my dear friend, for having been influenced by a sense of duty, whether erroneous or not, in what I have done on this trying occasion. I have many strong feelings on your side. I deeply sympathise with Mr. Peel in the difficulties of his situation: I am aware that there may be reasons for his not going out of office, of which I cannot possibly judge; above all I have little reason indeed to imagine that if I had been in his place I should have acted with more firmness than I suppose him to have done.

With all these impressions, though I believe it my duty to protest as I have done against his return, I cannot possibly feel any bitterness

¹ Newman's view of Pusey's position is given in the following passage from a letter to his sister: 'I do not reckon Pusey or Denison among our opponents, because they were strong for

concession beforehand; and Pusey I know thought most highly of Mr. Peel's integrity and generosity.'—*'Letters,'* i. 207.

on the subject; and I shall be *truly* grieved if I have unwarily expressed any, or given any, unnecessary pain.

I wish, my dear Pusey, if you have a good opportunity, and think it not improper, you would say something of this sort for me to the Bishop. It will be a great comfort to me if he can excuse me.

With best compliments to Mrs. Pusey, and in good hope that however this affair ends it will turn out for the best, since, as far as I can see or hear, it has hitherto been conducted in a good spirit on both sides,

I am ever, my dear Pusey,

Affectionately yours,

J. KEBLE, JUNR.

Bishop Lloyd's support of Roman Catholic Emancipation was of course dictated in the main by his belief that the measure was politically necessary, and logically involved in earlier concessions. In so independent a mind this conviction would have been formed by personal reflection; but it was probably reinforced by Mr. Peel. Bishop Lloyd had been Peel's tutor while he was himself still an undergraduate. In 1817 he had been selected to ask Peel to consent to represent the University in Parliament; and their intimacy had been continuously unbroken throughout life. Accordingly, although he had no intention of taking part in political questions, he did not hesitate to do his best in support of the Government on this occasion. His influence was exerted on Peel's side during the Oxford election; and he rendered efficient service to the Government by his memorable speech during a debate in the House of Lords which marks an epoch in English history. On March 24th a petition against the Government measure from 600 Cambridge undergraduates had been presented by the Bishop of Bath and Wells. Bishop Lloyd, while advising that the petition should be allowed to lie on the table, objected strongly to the encouragement of such forms of active interest in politics on the part of undergraduates, and stated that an undergraduate petition in favour of the Bill had been seized by the Proctors at Oxford. On April 2nd the Duke of Wellington moved the second reading

of the Bill; an amendment was proposed by Archbishop Howley, and seconded by the Primate of Ireland. Fourth in the debate rose Bishop Lloyd in support of the Government measure. It is impossible even at this distance of time to read his speech without feeling its courage and its power, even if some of the topics which he urges fail to convince us. Coming from such a quarter, it produced a great impression. In the House it was sharply criticized by Bishop Van Mildert and Lord Farnham: Bishop Lloyd spoke three times afterwards in self-defence. The Bill passed the House of Lords on April 10th by a majority of 105. The attacks to which Bishop Lloyd was exposed outside the House induced him, under Peel's advice, to publish a corrected copy of his speech. It was even said that he was exposed to a slight at Court in consequence of the line which he had felt it his duty to take in Parliament.

His last words in the House of Lords were uttered on April 8th. A few days afterwards he was taken ill; the illness was thought trifling; but it resulted in inflammation of the lungs, and terminated fatally on May 31st, the day after Ascension Day.

Following so closely on the Bishop's prominent action in Parliament, his death made a general and deep impression. On Pusey the blow fell with peculiar severity. Even when the illness had become very serious, Pusey, as Cardinal Newman remembered, could not believe that Lloyd would die. He had owed his present position to Bishop Lloyd's friendship: he had been guided, for six years, at every step, by his advice: he mourned his death as that of a 'second father,' as that of

'the guardian friend, with whose guidance I had hoped to steer securely amid all the difficult shoals through which the course of a theologian must in these days probably be held.'

It is natural, but perhaps useless, to speculate on the question what Pusey's theological career would have become had not the strong influence of the friend and patron of his early years been withdrawn thus early. One of the effects

of his death was undoubtedly to throw Pusey, although not immediately, into closer contact with the minds which, together with his own, were to give being and shape to the Movement of 1833.

The most serious work of Pusey's life during the five years which followed his appointment to the Chair in November 1828 was the completion of the Catalogue of Arabic Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library. This Catalogue was but a section of a larger work which had been taken in hand by the Bodleian Curators more than half a century before. It was originally due to the learning and munificence of Archbishop Laud that the Library was so richly endowed, and his example found numerous imitators, while from time to time the collection was increased by purchase. But this mass of literary wealth existed in a form which rendered it practically inaccessible to students. Many of the manuscripts had suffered from long neglect; several were mutilated; portions of one manuscript were bound up with another: they had come into the possession of the University in this condition, but as yet they remained in it. To Laud's earnest injunction that they should be properly taken care of and duly used, Convocation had answered: '*Nos haec manuscripta, quibus tam ditâsti academiam, inscribemus registro, recondemus animo, volvemus manu, enunciamus linguâ, et vita recudemus.*' But of these five promises the first had not yet been redeemed. It was at the instance of Archbishop Secker, among others, that the University first took in hand the work of cataloguing this portion of its treasures. Application was made to several Oriental scholars; but one after another they shrank from the long and wearisome toil.

At last a Hungarian pupil of Schultens, John Uri, was induced by Sir Joseph Yorke, the British Ambassador at the Hague, to undertake the work. After many years of hard labour, Uri produced the first volume of the Catalogue in 1787. It is a folio volume of 327 pages; but the amount of reading which it represents is enormous. It describes in terse Latin all that students might wish to

know about two thousand four hundred manuscripts—Hebrew, Syriac, Samaritan, Aethiopic, Arabic, Turkish, Persian, and Coptic. Still, Uri left to the University what was only a splendid fragment. For thirty-four years no effort was made to continue his work. The task was taken up by one who became Pusey's predecessor in the Chair of Hebrew, Alexander Nicoll, at that time Sub-librarian of the Bodleian. Nicoll set to work at the earnest suggestion of the Curators of the Library and of the Delegates of the Clarendon Press. Uri, it seems, had overlooked not a few manuscripts; and the University had made considerable additions to its collection since Uri's death. These Nicoll undertook to study and describe in a Supplementary Catalogue, and also to make a complete index to this work as well as his own. He was encouraged in his task by the names of most repute in Europe in this department of scholarship—Silvestre de Sacy, Bernstein, and Gesenius. When Nicoll died he had published a first instalment of his work—a folio volume of 143 pages. A much larger volume was needed to complete it, and of this he had at the time of his death prepared 388 pages folio.

The work that yet remained was indeed gigantic. It took Pusey no little time and labour to ascertain exactly the condition in which Nicoll had left his notes and the lines on which he intended to carry them forward to completion. He had to read through line by line the voluminous notes and extracts in Nicoll's handwriting, besides revising word by word Nicoll's translations from Arabic into Latin.

He had to make a full index to the labours of his predecessors, and in doing this he discovered that Uri's work had been far from accurate. Nicoll had not revised Uri's volume, and Pusey found that Uri's Index of Authors was not only incomplete but misleading. It was seldom, and only in the more accurate manuscripts, that the real name and style of an author was fully stated; in others sometimes the personal name, sometimes the patronymic, sometimes only the name of the tribe to

which the writer belonged, was stated. Uri had written out the titles too carelessly to distinguish in all cases between different authors, or to identify the same author under slightly altered designations; and thus before Pusey could complete his final index to the labours of his predecessors as well as his own, his work assumed vast proportions. As he made his way he discovered new fields of labour which Uri had overlooked. The manuscripts were not only of very unequal value—some of them were forgeries. All the purchasers of the Arabic manuscripts that had found their way into the Bodleian, with the solitary exception of Pococke, had been imposed upon by the artful Easterns¹. This discovery obliged Pusey to review all the manuscripts which Uri had catalogued, in order to see whether they agreed with their titles. The common trick had been to prefix the name of some well-known author or treatise to a perfectly worthless manuscript, in the confidence, which appeared to be well grounded, that the buyer would never think of examining the contents of his purchase. Sometimes the real title was covered over with paper; sometimes it was blotted out with ink; sometimes almost scratched out with a knife. A slight and dexterous change in the superscription would at times substitute a famous for an insignificant name; and indeed a single work, bulky but of no great value, might be broken up into three or four fragments. These fragments, ornamented with discreetly appended titles, would have impressed the purchaser,—incautious, trustful, perhaps ignorant,—as acquisitions of real value, while they would have added considerably to the ill-gotten wealth of the artful and unscrupulous vendor. The result of this discovery was that many manuscripts, supposed to be the works of distinguished authors, were at best anonymous, and Pusey had to spend much time in studying

¹ 'Codices, autem, in hunc finem evolventi, novus continuò campus apertus est; præter errores enim, quos ipse admiserit Urius, deprehendi omnibus ferè horum librorum emptori-

bus, uno Pocockio excepto, libros supposititios pro veris, subinde venditasse vafros Orientales.' Cat., vol. ii. pt. ii. præf. iv.

them, in order to discover if possible the name of the writer. In this effort he only occasionally succeeded¹; the greatest expenditure of toil and time was constantly unrewarded. Pusey characteristically ascribes this to some deficiency of his own: other labourers in the same field will, he anticipates, succeed much better.

Pusey profusely acknowledges his indebtedness to his masters in Arabic—Professors Kosegarten and Freytag. But the burden of this long and arid labour was his own. Writing eight years after the completion of his task to one who was engaged in a work involving more labour than had been at first anticipated, Pusey expressed himself in what could not have been the language of exaggeration or impulsiveness: ‘When engaged on the Arabic Catalogue at the Bodleian I have, as I rose to the drudgery, envied the very bricklayers whom I saw at work in the streets.’ The task took up the best part of his time during seven of the most active years of his life, and no idea of what it must have cost him can be gained except by an actual perusal of the result. In later years he would sometimes mourn that so much time had been withdrawn from theology, and then would add, ‘Of course it must have been better as God seemed thus to will it.’

Scholars, at any rate, could do justice then, as they do justice now, to this great effort of patient labour. In 1837 his friend Mr. Greenhill, afterwards a well-known Oxford resident, was studying medicine in Paris, and made the acquaintance of the accomplished Baron de Slane, the friend and pupil of Silvestre De Sacy. The conversation turned one day upon Pusey’s Arabic Catalogue, and Mr. Greenhill remarked that the Catalogue itself was partly the work of Dr. Nicoll. ‘If, sir,’ said the Baron, ‘Pusey had made nothing but the Index to such a Catalogue, it would have been enough to place him in the first rank of Arabic scholars.’

One feature in the Catalogue which would hardly be

¹ ‘Quod mihi aliquando benè successit, alias verò, ubi vel maximam operam collocavi, nihil omninò mihi contigit elicere.’

noticed at the present day, when illustrations of all kinds have become so general, excited the warm admiration of Continental Orientalists. Pusey reproduced¹ in facsimile some lines of the more famous ancient manuscripts². Of the many letters of thanks which Pusey received from foreign scholars and other friends he would probably have valued, and highly, that of his master, Freytag. 'The Catalogue,' wrote Freytag, 'will be an irrefragable proof for those who come after us, both of your talents and of your rare industry.' In return Freytag sent Pusey his Hebrew Grammar. He was printing off the fourth volume of his Arabic Lexicon, and hoped for health to finish it, although he found that the Rectorship of the University of Bonn, which fell to him in that year, would tax his time and strength heavily. The letter breathes the spirit of a devoted friendship: it was apparently the last which Pusey received from Freytag.

Not long after the completion of the Catalogue, Pusey sold his Arabic library: he 'wanted the money for the poor London churches and for the Library of the Fathers.' That he did so must be a matter of regret to scholars: a personal student's library, in process of time, becomes a literary whole, especially if it has issued in a considerable work, and the margins of the books which compose it have been carefully annotated³.

Besides the Arabic Catalogue, Pusey had other literary work in hand. During the remainder of 1829 he was busily occupied with writing the second part of the

¹ The specimens given are from the margins of the Catalogue which were supplied by Uri and Nicoll, and which contained the more interesting MSS. Pusey's vast labour was spent in a far more interesting field than his predecessors had worked on.

² Prof. R. P. A. Dozy, 'Notices sur quelques MSS. arabes,' Leyden, p. 28: 'Je finis en me permettant d'exprimer le vœu que les Orientaux veuillent bien publier (ainsi qu'il a déjà fait M. Pusey et quelques autres Orientalistes) des facsimiles de

quelques lignes des manuscrits remarquables et surtout des manuscrits autographes, ce qui, sans doute, facilitera beaucoup les recherches de ce genre.'

³ The writer has seen copies of Schnurrer's 'Bibliotheca Arabica,' Abulfeda's 'Moslem Annals,' and Casira's account of the Spanish-Arabic MSS. in the Library of the Escorial. Of this last work Pusey made great use in his Catalogue. They belong to Dr. Greenhill.

'Theology of Germany,' which he finished in March, 1830. He had also already begun to read for his B.D. degree. The exercises for the Divinity degrees were then still conducted in Latin and on the ancient model; and although the object of the University in proposing them as a test of theological knowledge was often evaded, they were worthier of the great subject than the English essays which have since taken their place. For Pusey nothing was trivial, and he set himself to read for his Divinity disputations as 'if he was going to write a book.' Owing to his illness in Nov. 1830, and other demands upon his time, he did not graduate as a Bachelor of Divinity until May 10, 1832. He did not take his Doctor's degree until Feb. 27, 1836.


Tholuck had asked Pusey to write an account of current English theological literature, or, as he phrases it, the more modern scientific-theological efforts in England. This account was to appear, at least in substance, in a magazine of theological literature which Tholuck and others were publishing. Pusey's paper represents very extensive reading, traces of which may be detected, again and again, in later years. He sent it to Tholuck on May 24, 1830, and it will be found in full in the Appendix to this chapter. It cannot but be interesting both as a sketch of English Theology at the time and also as giving Pusey's estimate of it.

Pusey's sorrow at the death of Bishop Lloyd was gradually relieved by interests nearer home. Within two months of the Bishop's death, on July 17, 1829, his first child, Lucy Maria Bouverie Pusey, was born at Christ Church, an event which he commemorated year by year with ever-increasing gratitude, until the end of his life. His deepest thoughts about his child find expression in a letter to Tholuck. After explaining the cause of delay in acknowledging Tholuck's last letter, he dwells on 'the intense thought so full of happiness to a Christian parent of the birth of an immortal being.'

The child was christened in the church of Pusey at the

afternoon service on Sunday, August 30th, Pusey himself officiating. He made a point of thus blending, when he could, his natural and his sacred ministerial relations towards those around him.

His second child and only son, Philip Edward, was born at Christ Church on June 14, 1830, and was baptized by his father at Pusey Church on the following St. James' Day, July 25, 1830. His third child, Katherine, was born on Jan. 8, 1832; his youngest, Mary (Mrs. Brine), on May 4, 1833.



DR. PUSEY'S LODGINGS IN CHRIST CHURCH.
(From the South-West.)

The October Term of 1830 found Pusey in the full swing of a busy Oxford life. To those who have known the University under very different social aspects, and are familiar with the great names that occur, the picture of the old society suggested by Mrs. Pusey's diary cannot be without interest. 'October 1. Mr. Newman called.—Sunday, October 3. Twice to the Cathedral. Messrs. Newman and Froude to dinner.—October 4. Walked with Edward and Mr. Newman.—October 20. Called on Mrs. Nicoll, Pett, Hawkins, Buckland, Bridges.'—

'October 22. Went to the Museum, the Horticultural Meeting, Magdalen, and All Souls. The Barnes', Dr. Bridges, and Mrs. Page and Buckley to dinner.—October 23. Called on Mrs. Whately. . . . The Hawkins' and Cardwells called.—24th, Sunday. Twice to the Cathedral. Sermon at St. Mary's from Dr. Shuttleworth. Mr. Newman dined with us. . . . [Read] Taylor and "Life and Correspondence of Bishop Heber."—October 28. Mr. Barnes, Dr. Whately, and Blanco White called.—31st, Sunday. Twice to the Cathedral. Dr. Woodcock's and Mr. Tyler's sermons. Dined at the Provost's. Met the Tylers. Messrs. Wilberforce, Newman, &c., in the evening.—November 8. [Read] Claudius, and [Scott's] "Demonology." Called on Mrs. Barnes, Lloyd, Nicoll, and Pett. Dr. and Mrs. Cotton, the Macbrides, the Cardwells, Messrs. Dornford, Hampden, Lee, Biscoe, and Oakeley to dinner. Lady Lucy breakfasted with us.—November 13. Went to All Souls and Magdalen. Messrs. Ward, Newman, W. Beach, Escott, and William to dinner.' Mrs. Pusey's brief notes are largely occupied with her private reading and domestic affairs; but these extracts illustrate the everyday society in which she and her husband lived, and the intimacies which were now forming or deepening, and which a few years hence would be of such vast importance to the Church.

On November 19th Mrs. Pusey writes in her diary: 'Edward poorly: with him all day.' This was the beginning of an illness which lasted for more than four months; and, at one time, seemed to wear a very serious aspect. A blood-vessel, it seems, had given way; but this was rather the symptom than the cause of a general failure of strength. He had over-exerted himself, mainly by excessive study, and then by an effort to speak, when feeling more than usually weak. As soon as possible he was removed by easy stages to Hastings, where he remained until the following March.

This illness had decisive effects upon Pusey's life and work. It taught him that the almost boundless fields of

literary activity which he had hoped to traverse must, some of them, be unvisited. Practically it obliged him to abandon his plan of cataloguing the Arabic manuscripts in all the Oxford libraries¹. He had to confine himself to the limits of the enterprise which his predecessor, Dr. Nicoll, had sketched out.

But from this illness dates also a deepened earnestness of character and purpose. It was the moral lever which raised him from the atmosphere of Bonn and Berlin to that of the Oxford of later years. Newman, who was himself weak and deaf from overwork², had written to him on the moral value of sickness, with the entire unreserve of a sincere friend. Pusey's reply shows that, in his own judgment, the warning was needed, and that it was gratefully received.

E. B. P. TO THE REV. J. H. NEWMAN.

MY DEAR FRIEND,

Hastings, Feb. 1, [1831].

I know not how to thank you for your very kind and loving letter, which has given me such great pleasure, and which may, I hope, with God's blessing, be the means of doing me good, and which has pained me only (and that wholesomely) in showing me—not how much your inferior I am in humility (for that though I must not be content to remain, I may not be discontented to find myself)—but how poor my humility looks, and that you think so much too highly of me. This has indeed been a season of more than usual thought of myself, and I trust it will have the effects (or at least some of the effects, for all, I dare not hope) for which it was intended, and I hope, even as an instrument to think less of myself than I did some time past. I suspect that there has been a leading mistake of my later life, to view my existence too much in relation to others, not I hope in exclusion to myself, yet still too predominantly. I was of course aware that without making the tree good, the fruits by which others were to benefit could not be good: yet I fear that often the desire of attaining some, which I thought a great, end and the consciousness of being engaged in a good cause, has engrossed me too entirely, and made me think of my existence too much in reference to what might be accomplished by my means here, instead of looking pre-eminently to the preparing myself to meet my

¹ Bibl. Bodl. Cod. MSS. Orient. Cat., praef. p. iv: 'praeparatione aliquâ jam adhibitâ, gravi morbo

admonitus, a novo hoc labore destiti.'

² 'Letters, &c.' i. 236.

God. I am not sure that I have expressed myself clearly. I hope that it has been rather a reversing of the proportions, than a neglect of either: that I have at times looked rather to the becoming fit for Heaven by being useful to others upon earth, than to fit myself for Heaven, and allow my usefulness to follow naturally from my own amendment; to have thought a day lost, according as I had, or had not been useful, rather than as I had advanced myself. Perhaps this among other objects was the end of this long illness, and the consequent inaction: yet I do not think that this time, I have, since the very first, been at all impatient of my inaction; and if I was anxious to return at the beginning of this Term, it was not from the wish of being personally engaged, but to prevent calumny attaching to us generally from any omission, if not absolutely necessary.

You will perhaps not think matters much improved, if I say that I have not so much been impatient of inaction as of employments, which I thought necessary, but still had no immediate good religious result in view, as my 'defence' and the Arab. Cat., since I ought to have been content to discharge these offices, if they became necessary, and the more so, as the one was in part a punishment, which I fear I never thought of. I am however not concerned to clear myself in any degree, but to make the best use, which God shall enable me, of your kind advice, and to enable you to continue it, as occasion may offer.

I have not time for more, except to thank you from the bottom of my heart for the very Christian friendship of your letter. I do hope that you will, at least, though I fear slowly, see such effects as to encourage you to proceed, but you, I know, will proceed without such outward encouragement.

I commend to your kind services, if any occasion offers, my servant Richard (the bearer of this), whom I have sent home in consequence of his sudden loss.

With blessings and prayers for you,

Ever your very affectionate friend,

E. B. PUSEY.

Writing some months later to Mr. B. Harrison he uses his own experience:—

'You will, I trust, be constantly reminded that continued sober and steady exertion is, with God's blessing, most likely to preserve the frame of mind as well as the strength necessary to be permanently useful to His Church. . . . Having repeatedly exhausted myself, I dread to see over-exertion in others: I suspect also that, at such times, one is inclined to ascribe more to one's own agency than is fitting.'

His own object henceforth was to devote himself more exclusively to the duties of his Chair in the wide and deep

sense in which he understood them, and thus, so far as he might, to promote the work of the Church of Christ¹.

Mr. Newman at this time had begun to write on the Thirty-nine Articles, and had also accepted a proposal of Mr. H. J. Rose and Mr. Lyall to 'furnish them with a history of the principal Councils,'—an effort which, in the event, issued in that most stimulating and instructive of books, 'The Arians of the Fourth Century.'

Pusey's relations with him on these subjects are exhibited in the subjoined letter:—

E. B. P. TO THE REV. J. H. NEWMAN.

MY DEAR NEWMAN,

Hastings, March 17, 1831.

I have been so much occupied for the last two days with out-of-doors employment about a poor invalid, ill in body and mind and estate, that I have not had time to write more than two very urgent letters. I am truly glad that you have undertaken the work on the Articles, as I think it is very much wanted, and there seems scarcely a commencement of what you will do satisfactorily, an illustration of the historical sense of the language employed in them. With regard to the Councils, though, as generally treated, they are the driest portion of Ecclesiastical History, I should think an account of them might be made both interesting and improving, by exhibiting them in reference to and as characteristic of the age in which they occurred. You may also be of much service, I hope, in stemming heterodoxy, one of whose strongest holds is perhaps the so-called history of doctrines. I shall be much rejoiced, then, if you undertake the whole task proposed. I do not think that there will be much to be gained for your object from German writers, or rather to be lost from your not consulting them; but I shall be most glad, when at Oxford, to render you any assistance *fontes adire remotos*. Some of the Fathers, or rather parts of the Fathers, you must of course read, but this will all aid towards your great object. I should think this little essay would be of great use to yourself towards nerving you for that design; I hope it, and indeed the whole undertaking, will be of use to the Church as well as to individuals in it, by showing that she is awake. Oh for the conclusion of the Catalogue and the time when my hands will be free! But all in God's good time.

I have no time for more. I may regard myself now as quite well, although my chest is still not strong. I hope, however, to be back at

¹ Bibl. Bodl. Cat. MSS. Orient.,
praef. p. iv: 'quo me ad ea studia
totum conferrem, quae officium meum

propius attingerent, et sacrosanctae
matri ecclesiae (si fieri possit) quantu-
lascunque utilitates afferrent.'

the beginning of next term, and to give at least one course of lectures (doctors approving).

With Maria's kind regards,

Your very affectionate friend,

E. B. PUSEY.

At this period Pusey became interested in an academical contest which was not without important bearings on his future work and life through the relations into which it brought him with one mind of exceptional distinction. A Professorship of Sanscrit in the University had just been founded under the will of Colonel Boden. The motive of this foundation, as stated in Colonel Boden's will, was the

'opinion that a more general and critical knowledge of the Sanscrit language will be a means of enabling his countrymen to proceed in the conversion of the natives of India to the Christian religion, by disseminating a knowledge of the Sacred Scriptures amongst them, more effectually than all other means whatsoever.'

The Professor was to hold his Chair for life, on five conditions, one of which was that he might 'not hold or teach doctrines contrary to those of the Church of England.'

The establishment of such a Chair excited much interest, not merely in the world of literature and scholarship, but also, and especially, among those who had at heart the cause of Christian missions and the extension of the Church of Christ. Two candidates appeared in the field, Mr. Horace Hayman Wilson, and the Rev. Dr. W. H. Mill, lately Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, and Principal of Bishop's College, Calcutta. Of Dr. Mill it may be said, in Pusey's own words at a later date, that he was the greatest theologian, in the true sense of that term, which the University of Cambridge had produced since Pearson, certainly the greatest in the present century. To that metaphysical basis and form of thought which is the raw material of theology, Dr. Mill joined a scholarship as wide in its range as it was accurate in its details. As yet his real titles to respect had only been recognized by a limited circle; but the creation of the Chair of Sanscrit at once suggested a man who combined, as few others could

combine them, philological accomplishments with the religious character and interests contemplated by the founder. Dr. Mill's candidature was earnestly supported by Newman, Keble, and Pusey, who are thus found for the first time acting together¹ in a matter of public academical interest, as well as by other Churchmen like Dr. Ogilvie, who were, in later years, often and widely separated from them.

In the event Mr. Wilson was elected by 207 votes as against 200 for Dr. Mill. Pusey and Newman were both, and greatly, disappointed. To Newman it must have appeared a step in that onward march of Liberalism which 'fretted him inwardly'². Pusey refers to it in characteristic terms.

E. B. P. TO REV. R. SALWEY.

April 29, 1832.

Of late I have been especially busy in a matter in which I thought the interests of our faith concerned, the election of Dr. Mill to the Sanscrit professorship. God, however, has ordered it otherwise. And in the practical conviction of His love to His Church and to ourselves, one may gradually cease to know what disappointment is, since all is of His appointment, and therefore wisest and best; and then probably most evidently so when it is contrary to what we, in our ignorance, think wise and good.

Sometimes Pusey would remark on this election, 'Things might have been very different in Oxford if it had pleased God that Mill should be among us.'

Another object which Pusey had at heart at this time, and of which he never quite lost sight throughout his life, was the translation of the Arabic Commentary of Rabbi Tanhum (of Jerusalem) on the Old Testament. Pococke warmly praises Rabbi Tanhum, 'as dexterous an expositor as any among the Jewish doctors'³: and regrets that his manuscripts had not been printed, and were so little known in the seventeenth century⁴. Pusey thought that the Asiatic Translation Society would be willing to make

¹ 'Letters by Rev. J. B. Mozley,' Rivingtons, 1885, p. 27.

² 'Apologia pro Vitâ Suâ,' 1864, p. 97.

³ Pococke's 'Comm. on Micah,' p. 117.

⁴ Ibid., pref. p. x.

a work so recommended accessible to the English reader, and he applied to Mr. Houghton, the secretary, offering to undertake the translation and to edit the Arabic text. The reply has not been found: the Society was probably too heavily weighted by its engagements with Professor Kosegarten and others to undertake any new and costly effort in Arabic. Some years afterwards, when the Arabic Catalogue was finished, Pusey began a translation of Tanhum on the Minor Prophets. Referring to this, quite at the close of his life, he observed:—

‘There is only one MS. of Rabbi Tanhum’s Commentary of the Minor Prophets in Europe¹, and that is in the Bodleian. I took to the work of translating Tanhum dutifully, because Pococke praised him so much. But after transcribing a great deal I found that he constantly referred to something else that he had written on the historical books. Then I began transcribing his Commentary on these books until I discovered that his philosophy was Maimonides and his philology Abul Walid². So, thinking that it would do no good to the young men to find that histories took place in vision, I gave up the work.’

The idea of founding scholarships to encourage the study of Hebrew seems to have occupied Pusey’s mind from the earliest days of his professorial life. From the first, too, it is plain, he wished to promote a knowledge of the sacred language, not only or chiefly as a department of philological science, but as the handmaid of theology. In the words of an original draft of the regulations for the proposed scholarships, it is stated that the primary object of founding them is ‘to promote such a knowledge of Hebrew as may be most beneficial to sound theology, and thereby to the Church.’ With this object the sum of £3000 was set apart, and Pusey hoped that the first scholar might be elected in Michaelmas Term, 1831.

But the plan was delayed until the foundation of some other Hebrew Scholarships under the will of Mrs.

¹ M. Neubauer informs me that there is a MS. of Tanhum on Isaiah and the Psalms at St. Petersburg.

² M. Neubauer tells me that in philosophy Tanhum knows Farabi and

Averroes as well as Maimonides; and that besides Abul Walid he quotes David Kimchi and Judah Hayyuj for grammar and lexicography. But, in the main, Pusey’s remark is accurate.

Kennicott was completed. Although welcomed by Pusey, this arrangement did not satisfy his ideal, and he therefore hastened to complete his own scheme. In conjunction with his brother, Philip Pusey, and the Rev. Edward Ellerton, D.D., Fellow of Magdalen College, he invested a sum of money in an estate in the parishes of Grandborough and Willoughby in the county of Warwick, which yielded a rent of £100 a year. Of this sum the destination was more defined and more comprehensive than that of the Kennicott benefaction. The scholar must be resident: he must study the cognate languages as well as Hebrew; but it is especially stated that

‘besides an accurate and critical acquaintance with the original Scriptures of the Old Testament, the application of the knowledge of Hebrew to the illustration of the New, or to that of any portion of theology, lies within the contemplation of the founders.’

It is in accordance with this wider aim that the Regius Professor of Divinity, as well as the Lord Almoner’s Reader in Arabic, are named electors for the scholarships. This new foundation was accepted by Convocation on March 22, 1832.

While occupied in his efforts on behalf of Dr. Mill, Pusey was also engaged in a very different and much more popular method of defending the interests of the faith. The Rotunda in the Blackfriars Road, Southwark, had been for some time devoted to the propagation of infidelity, and among the lecturers was a clergyman who had renounced Christianity, and after professing repentance had relapsed, and was surpassing his previous efforts against Christianity. His infidelity was of the coarser type which would have few attractions for persons of education. But he had written a diatribe against the historical worth of the inspired account¹ of our Lord’s miraculous Birth, which seems to have attracted a certain measure of attention. Apparently at the suggestion of

¹ ‘The Devil’s Pulpit,’ No. 1, March 4, 1831. The Star of Bethlehem, a sermon preached by his

Highness’s chaplain, the Rev. Robert Taylor, B.A., at the Rotunda, Blackfriars Road, Nov. 7, 1830.

his brother, the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge applied to Pusey in July, 1831, to prepare an answer to this and other productions of a like description¹. Neither Pusey's habits of mind, experience, or style were such as to fit him for the duties of a popular writer against coarse unbelief; yet he had no hesitation about applying himself to a task which seemed to come to him as a duty. Writing to his brother William, he justifies himself for undertaking this unsuitable task:—

'The subject is one to which from the unhappy state of a friend's mind I gave much attention some years ago, and which, in consequence, I imagine that I could treat with less consumption of time and less violence to my feelings, which were harassed by it of old, than others.'

He adds, however:—

'These Rotunda proceedings are very depressing, and it is a great sacrifice to meddle with them. Happy those who have only to cultivate the Lord's vineyard, instead of repairing the hedge which the wild boar out of the wood has broken down.'

Pusey appears to have written four letters, addressed to readers of 'The Devil's Pulpit,' and signed 'A Christian.' Of these one at least was printed, but the Society seems to have thought them too long and also 'heavy,' and in fact but ill adapted for popular readers. Indeed, the writer himself was as conscious as anybody that such a criticism would be natural. 'I have looked over the first letter,' he writes to his brother, 'and am rather agreeably surprised; it is clearer and less dull than I expected.' From the fragments which remain in manuscript it would seem that Pusey followed, with patient and conscientious attention, the wildest and crudest explanations of the miracle of the Nativity, treating his opponents, as always, with seriousness and respect, thinking nothing too unimportant or too absurd to be noticed, and taking little or no account of method or style while engaged in this absorbing effort. Pusey thought of printing the letters independently; he

¹ On the proceedings of the Infidel Tract Committee, see Churton's 'Memoir of Joshua Watson,' i. 323.

would not have the Society pressed to accept anything against the judgment of its literary advisers. In the event nothing would seem to have come of the effort, and, excepting some unimportant fragments, the manuscript has been lost.

During the Long Vacation of 1832 Pusey had plenty of work on hand. The British Association had held its first meeting in Oxford during the month of June, and on the 21st the honorary degree of D.C.L. was bestowed on four of its distinguished members, Brewster, Faraday, Brown, and Dalton. Keble, who was now Professor of Poetry, was angry at the 'temper and tone of the Oxford doctors'; they had 'truckled sadly to the spirit of the times' in receiving 'the hodge podge of philosophers' as they did. Dr. L. Carpenter had assured Dr. Macbride that 'the University had prolonged her existence for a hundred years by the kind reception he and his fellows had received.' 'Hawkins,' wrote Keble, 'goes about, I am told, congratulating the University on the extreme advantage of having obtained the good word of' the men of science. At the same time Keble was actively engaged in getting up a testimonial to the Duke of Wellington; it was to be 'an encouragement to loyalty at a time when it seems to be at a sad discount,' as well as a tribute of admiration to the greatest of English soldiers. In this project Newman and Pusey also were warmly interested.

About the same time also Pusey preached a sermon which, as being the first that found its way into print, deserves more than a passing notice. The occasion was the consecration of a small church at Grove, a poor hamlet of Wantage. As Vicar of the neighbouring parish of Denchworth, Mr. Cotton was much interested in this effort to make spiritual provision for a neglected neighbourhood. 'Cotton,' Pusey wrote to Newman, 'was about to apply to you [to preach], and only seized upon me because I was present, and therefore could less elude his grasp.'

Pusey's preparation for this sermon is very characteristic.

If he had been getting ready for the University pulpit, he could scarcely have taken greater pains.

'If I am to preach,' he writes to Newman, more than a month before the day of consecration, 'I should like you to tell me what you think a consecration sermon, which is also a collecting sermon, ought to be. It is to be preached on a week-day, and the audience will, I suppose, in great measure be rich neighbours. I had thought of spicing my sermon with some Christian or Jewish antiquities about churches; and should then be much obliged to you to send me the Oriel Bingham, if allowable, Vitringa, Buxtorf "*de Synagogâ Vetere*," or any other book which might contain any illustrations of the early interest of Christians about churches, &c. I should be also much obliged to you to send me the first three volumes of Neander's "*Kirchengeschichte*" (in my study, division nearest to the passage door, third or fourth shelf), his "*Gelegenheitsschriften*" (a small, thin volume, *ibid.*), and Calvin (further partition, *ibid.*) on the Minor Prophets.'

In Mrs. Pusey's diary for August 14th the following entry occurs: 'Grove Church consecrated by the Bishop of Sarum¹. E. preached "an eloquent and impressive discourse."'

The subject of the sermon is the prophecy of Haggai respecting the glory of the Second Temple. It touches with deep sincerity upon most or all of the topics which would have occurred to the preacher in after years; but he has not yet attained to the peculiar intensity which became the secret of his power. The most striking and characteristic passages are those on the indwelling of Christ in Christians, and on the cholera, which had just broken out in Oxford. In connexion with the former topic, he does not mention the sacraments; and he employs the untheological expression 'Our Saviour's Human Person,' in a manner which his growing dread of an unconscious Nestorianism among the clergy would have assuredly forbidden in the latter part of his life².

Bishop Burgess, the consecrating prelate, expressed the wish, 'not,' he said, 'as a matter of form,' that the sermon

¹ It will be remembered that, at the date referred to, Berkshire still formed part of the diocese of Salisbury.

² The sermon is printed at the end

of a volume of Parochial Sermons preached on various occasions. Oxford, Parker, 1865.

should be printed: and the Bishop's desire was supported by other requests. Pusey hesitated, and wrote to ask Newman's advice on the matter.

E. B. P. TO REV. J. H. NEWMAN.

Christ Church, Aug., 1832.

The sermon which I preached for *you* at Grove met with the fate that it would have been more entitled to had you preached it: it extracted £71 and was 'ordered to be printed.' . . .

Now to myself the sermon appears infinitely less calculated to be printed than even the former one; because it is more in the form of a sermon than the other; and there is no one subject discussed in it, as I was obliged to make it very popular, it being partly a charity sermon, partly for the poor inhabitants of Grove. . . .

How far might this sort of incidental protest against the sad neglect of our heathen countrymen in our great towns or our villages, or the greater publicity given to the success with which the exertions have in this case been blessed, be likely to produce other similar [exertions]?

To solve this I send you my sermon; but I must *insist* that you will not even look at it, if you are hurried still with your work or need repose. Should you advise this to be printed (which I think you will not), what should you do with regard to the other? . . . Be assured that you will act most kindly to me by consulting your own comfort.

Your very affectionate friend,

E. B. PUSEY.

I was truly glad to hear from Mrs. Newman that you were much better. I am to preach (God willing) on Oct. 14 in Ch. Ch.

Newman advised him to do as the Bishop wished; and accordingly the sermon was printed, with a long note on national chastisements—a subject which greatly occupied the minds of the early Tractarians—added to it.

Pusey returned to Oxford to preach on October 14th before a more critical audience his first University sermon. It was preached at Christ Church, from the pulpit which a later utterance of the same preacher has made historical. The pulpit then stood outside the choir-screen, opposite the seats of the Vice-Chancellor and proctors. In fact the whole arrangement of the interior of the Cathedral is now entirely different. His text was Psalm xlv. 6, 'Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever'; and the object of the preacher was to show that the exclusive reference of the Psalm is to our Lord Jesus Christ. By

this means Pusey avoided the difficulties of a 'second sense,' while at the same time he vindicated in the strongest manner the Messianic application of the Psalm.

Such language is noticeable in regard to the history of his religious thought. When he first went to Germany, he had seen difficulties in the application of some of the Psalms to our Saviour, and of this in particular among others. Now he could not admit that it applied to any one else¹.

'Its sublimity, the solemnity of its opening, the majesty of its descriptions, and the greatness of its promises alike proclaim that a greater than Solomon, and He alone, is here.'

Immediately after preaching it, Pusey seems to have sent this, as he had already sent the sermon which he preached at Grove, to Whately, who returned it, annotated in pencil with characteristic criticisms. 'Why should the higher reference of the Psalm exclude a lower and a primary one?' Pusey's position was that the language of the Psalm itself compelled this exclusion; Whately argued that while the New Testament obliged us to believe that 'Christ is the spiritual subject of the Psalm, Solomon is still the temporal subject,' and that to him alone some of its language is applicable. Pusey had deprecated the attempt to press the reference to our Lord in minute details, as by interpreting the 'vestments of the king' of Christ's human nature, the 'ivory palaces' of the purity of the hearts of believers, the 'daughter of Tyre' of the Syrophœnician woman of the Gospel: such interpretations implied 'weakness of faith.' Whately here would read 'superabundance of fancy.' Whately objected to the length of the introduction—or, as Bishop Wilberforce would have said, the 'Porch'; it had taken up nine pages out of twenty, which, even if the sermon was to be followed by two others, was disproportionate.

Not many weeks after this Pusey lost his infant

¹ His ripest judgment on the scope of this verse is given in 'Daniel the Prophet,' ed. 2, pp. 473-478.

daughter, Katherine, on November 7th. She had been christened by Newman at St. Mary's on St. Matthias' Day of the same year.

On the day of her death Pusey wrote as follows:—

MY DEAR NEWMAN, Ch. Ch., Wedn. morn. [Nov. 7, 1832].

Our dear little one, who, by your ministry, was made a member of Christ's Church, has been removed from all struggle and sin before it knew them. Her departure was sudden, but we have great reason to thank God for His mercies in everything relating to it. She promised fair to have been a meek and quiet spirit here, but she is gone (which since it is so, must be far better) 'her Father's household to adorn.'

We would see *you* gladly any day after this week, but cannot bear mixed society on Tuesday.

Your very affectionate friend,

E. B. PUSEY.

The reply has been carefully treasured¹:—

MY DEAR PUSEY, Oriel, Nov. 12, [1832].

I trust the retirement of the country has been blessed to you and Mrs. Pusey, as I am sure it has. It only requires to be alone, to receive the comfort which is (so to say) necessarily involved in the pain under which you now suffer. Of course only parents can tell the sorrow of the loss of a child; but all persons can see the comfort contained in it—to know you have given eternal life and happiness to an immortal spirit, and to be released from the responsibility of teaching her right from wrong and from the uncertainties of her final destiny. You have done for her what you could—you have dedicated her to God, and He has taken the offering.

For me, I have had a great privilege in being the means of her dedication. It is our only service which we dare perform with a rejoicing conscience and a secure mind; and in the recollection it becomes doubly precious, and a festival-work, when, as in the case of your dear little one, we have the certainty of our prayers being accepted.

I am going to town to-day, so write this instead of calling.

Ever yours affectionately,

J. H. NEWMAN.

A few days after her death Pusey is able to write at greater length to his brother William:—

We had thought on the first day of those beautiful lines of Keble.

¹ It is also printed in Newman's Letters, &c.' i. 278; the peculiar differences suggest that Newman preserved a rough draft of this letter.

He is a very soothing writer, because so calmly, deeply pious. He seems to have realized to a very high degree the piety as of a son to a father, and it is by practically realizing to one's-self (which is very different from acknowledging or even believing) that God is a Father to us, and that we, though at one time disobedient and very unthankful, are sons, that every event of life is set in its real light. A true Christian can be the only real Optimist, for he alone can *feel* that happen what may, it must be best since it comes from a Father's love, and that not least so, but rather the most so, when the tones of His voice are the most earnest. . . .

The evening before [the funeral] her little face still looked beautifully asleep, as it is. I accompanied it alone to the Cathedral (Maria having given up her own longing wish to do so with me, as I feared for her health).

You recollect Keble's beautiful lines :—

‘E'en such a solemn soothing calm
We sometimes see alight,’ &c.

They are true. With one or two exceptions, I could not have imagined that such a holy calm would have come over me, that even at that most trying moment one's heart should be so cheered and so stilled, and that one should have been enabled so to follow those elevating but probing words, ‘We give Thee *heartly* thanks that it hath pleased Thee to deliver this our sister,’ &c.

We purpose to stay at this dear peaceful place until Monday week, but as I at all events shall go over to lecture on the usual days, I should receive a letter there as soon or sooner than here. God bless you.

With Maria's kindest love,

Your very affectionate brother,

E. B. PUSEY.

Pusey House, Nov. 11 [1832].

On the anniversary of their loss three years afterwards Pusey writes to his wife:—

‘It becomes to me more and more a solemn day, for although it is a great mercy of God that she is safe, and is one of Christ's lambs, nay, is with Christ, part of Whose Body she was made, still it is a privilege for those who serve God with the duties of a whole life. Hers, although a happy, blessed lot, does not seem, according to Scripture, the best lot; and then there comes to one's remembrance such texts as, “Art thou come unto me to call my sins to remembrance and to slay my son?” words so forcible that (the more since they are recorded) I cannot consider [them] simply the woman's own, but intended to teach us. Then the death of David's child, and the blessedness of a long life under the Old Covenant, which could not be meant as simply to end there, without having something corresponding to it under the New, i.e. I do

not think that "length of days" would have been so much and so often spoken of as a blessing, and the blessing bestowed by "Wisdom" on the "Fear of God," unless it had been in some real way a blessing beyond the term of earthly existence. The impression has come gradually upon me, and so the more irresistibly, that the loss of our dear Katherine was not merely a trial of my cheerful surrender of her, as I at first thought it, but a chastisement to me.'

At the close of 1832 Pusey completed his '*Remarks on the Prospective and Past Benefits of Cathedral Institutions.*'

This pamphlet was occasioned by the appearance of a brochure by Robert Eden, Lord Henley, entitled, '*A Plan of Church Reform, with a Letter to the King.*' Lord Henley was a barrister, and a Commissioner of Bankruptcy. In 1824 he had married a daughter of Sir Robert Peel. Any writer in Lord Henley's position would have commanded attention when discussing a matter of public interest. And Church Reform, in all its departments, was just then being discussed in many quarters, and with unprecedented eagerness. The first Reform Bill had passed the House of Lords on June 7, 1832. The Reformed Parliament was to meet early in 1833. It was taken for granted that the first effort of a Reformed Parliament must be to reform the Church. Candidates for parliamentary honours were making the crudest proposals on the subject from the hustings. Three days after the passing of the Reform Bill Arnold wrote to Tyler: 'the Church, as it now stands, no human power can save¹.' Arnold's pamphlet on '*The Principles of Church Reform,*' which appeared early in 1833, reflected the widespread panic. 'I wrote that pamphlet,' he afterwards pleaded,

'in 1833, when most men, myself among the number, had an exaggerated impression of the strength of the movement party, and of the changes which it was likely to effect².'

Cooler heads than Arnold undoubtedly shared his apprehensions. Writing in October 1832 to Mr. Perceval, who

¹ '*Arnold's Life and Correspondence,*' 8th ed. vol. i. 264.

² *Ibid.* i. 273.

afterwards took a not unimportant part in the early days of the Oxford movement, Keble says :—

‘I have been considering, as well as I could, what line it becomes the clergy to take with a view to the possible proceedings of the first revolutionary Parliament, when it assembles. And I have made up my mind that we can hardly be too passive, until something really illegal, and contrary to our oaths and engagements, is pressed on us ; such as I conceive it would be were we to admit alterations in the Liturgy or Articles on less authority than that by which they were sanctioned : or to be aiding in any compromise which should transfer corporate property to other people on any pretence of equalization or the like.’

Half a century ago, and indeed at a later period, the cathedrals must have seemed to present the most vulnerable feature in the Church’s system. For learning they were doing little ; for the spiritual well-being of the people still less. Their daily services were scantily attended¹ ; their vast naves were only regarded as galleries of art. Friends and foes alike spoke of them as the chosen homes of dignified leisure, in which poetry and archaeology, rather than anything directly bearing on the moral and spiritual life of the Church of Christ, were a first consideration.

Lord Henley wrote in a spirit friendly to the Church, but with less knowledge than zeal. His remarks on non-residence, sinecures, and pluralities would not now be challenged in any quarter ; his insistence on the claims of the dense populations in the manufacturing districts was well-timed and not unnecessary. But if there was little room for controversy as to the disease, controversy could not but begin with the projected remedy. Lord Henley proposed the appointment of a board to manage all Episcopal and Capitular Estates. The objects to be kept in view by this board were strictly defined. The incomes of the Bishops were to be equalized. The staff of each cathedral was to consist of a Dean or other residentiary, and two Chaplains. In this way a saving of £250,000 a

¹ There were, of course, honourable exceptions, such as that of Exeter. ‘Cath. Inst.’ p. 7, note (2nd ed.).

year would be effected. This surplus was to be applied to the increase of the endowments of Chapter benefices, and of other livings in cathedral cities, and then to augmenting country livings, building residences, and building and endowing churches and chapels in poor and populous districts. New bishoprics were to be established at Windsor and Southwell, and pensions were to be provided for aged clergymen. The Bishops were no longer to sit in the House of Lords, and Convocation was to be revived.

Lord Henley's proposal was a challenge¹, and it provoked replies from Dr. Burton², the Regius Professor of Divinity, from Mr. Perceval³, and others. Pusey concerned himself with Lord Henley's scheme only so far as it related to the redistribution of cathedral endowments. He had intended his criticism to take the form of a public letter to Lord Henley. Newman suggested that he would be more at liberty to express himself with entire freedom if he threw it into the form of a pamphlet. As such it appeared in the early days of 1833⁴.

Pusey meets Lord Henley by the broad assertion that he has overlooked the highest services which have in the past been rendered by the cathedral clergy to the English Church. They have been

'the nurseries of most of our chief divines, who were the glory of our English name: in them these great men consolidated the strength which has been so beneficial to the Church.'

In support of this statement Pusey produces a long list

¹ Dr. Hook writes sternly of him as 'a wolf in sheep's clothing.' Letter to Hon. and Rev. A. P. Perceval, Nov. 5, 1832.

² 'Thoughts upon the Demand for Church Reform,' by the Rev. Edward Burton, D.D., Regius Professor of Divinity, Canon of Christ Church. Roake and Varty. This was followed by 'Sequel to remarks on Church Reform, with observations upon the Plan proposed by Lord Henley.'

³ 'Letter to Lord Henley,' by Hon. and Rev. A. P. Perceval.

⁴ 'Remarks on the Prospective and Past Benefits of Cathedral Institutions in the Promotion of Sound Religious Knowledge, occasioned by Lord Henley's plan for their abolition,' by Edward Bouverie Pusey, B.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew, Canon of Christ Church, late Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford. London, Roake and Varty, 1833.

of writers on divinity connected with Cathedrals, while he notices such distinguished exceptions as Hooker and Barrow, who do in fact only illustrate the rule. Generally speaking the duties of the parochial clergy leave them no time for learned studies, and the circumstances of the day were not such as to enable the Church to dispense with them. In a passage of profound foresight, but which at the time may well have read as the language of a timid alarmist, Pusey observes that

‘our next contest will be, in all probability, with a half-learned infidelity. We have done, we may hope, with the dreams and fictions of the Dupuis and Volneys—there is in England too much sound common judgement for these to make any lodgement. We shall not suffer much, probably, from the shallowness of French, or from the speculations of the unsound part of German metaphysics: the one is too commonplace for us, and we are too much bent upon physical science and matters of sense to employ ourselves on the other. But the struggle will probably be with shallow views of the older Dispensation, shallow conceptions and criticisms of Divine truths, superficial carpings at the details of revelation, an arbitrary selection of such portion of its doctrines as may best admit of being transmuted into some corresponding doctrine of Deistical belief.’

It was not a sufficient answer to say that the need would be met by the Universities. They were chiefly and necessarily employed ‘in providing a Christian and enlightened education for the whole community,’ and, as a consequence, ‘the theology of our country has ceased for the most part to be the immediate produce of our Universities, nor can it to any great extent again become so.’ The Universities had contributed to theology names as great as any of which Germany could boast, and Pusey suggests that their slender staff of professors might be strengthened by setting apart two canonries of Christ Church to endow chairs of Ecclesiastical History and Practical Theology, a suggestion which became the basis of legislation seven years afterwards. But if Cathedrals were to meet the Church’s needs, appointments to them must be made on different principles from those which had guided the advisers of the Crown in the earlier years of the House of Brunswick.

Pusey quotes the stern and well-known language of Bishop Warburton and Bishop Newton, and exclaims that

‘the time past has been long enough to degrade the service of God, and make offices appointed for His honour subservient only to the momentary and often selfish strife of worldly politics.’

When insisting upon the services of Cathedrals in the past history of the Church, Pusey engages in a review of the strength and deficiencies of English theology. After quoting a striking passage from Chalmers, he describes English theology as ‘a theology richer and more solid than that of any other Church.’ He notices, and to a certain extent admits, the criticism that it was deficient in large and systematic works on Dogmatic Theology, Biblical Interpretation, Christian Ethics, and Ecclesiastical History. But, he observes, the fundamental peculiarity of our English theology is its ‘occasional’ character. After observing that it is difficult to ‘name any one great work for whose production some ground in the circumstances of the Church cannot be assigned,’ he adds:—

‘It is well that it should be so, for this practical and Catholic spirit, in that it subdues the feeling of self, and exalts that of a great and solemn responsibility to our fellow-Christians and to God, affords the best guarantee that the works so conceived shall serve no temporary interest or perishable ends, shall not be defiled by human passions or prejudices, but, having God and God’s glory for their end and aim, shall have also for their aim that truth which is to be found in God only. The works originating in this spirit, though suggested by some special occasion, yet are written for all times, and are a blessing for all ages; because the spirit which dictated them, and the principles which they impart, will endure for ever.’

When sketching the services which Cathedrals ought to render in the future to the cause of sacred learning, Pusey points to his own experience of the German universities. His judgment about them is now much more balanced and matured than it was when he first wrote on the subject. Their defects consist in a want of sufficient preparatory education before the study of theology is commenced, in the absence of moral guidance, and in an unchecked liberty to migrate from one university to another, from one professor

to another, at pleasure. Their treatment of serious subjects was ill-suited to the average student.

‘The momentous subjects of inspiration or revelation, the canon of Scripture, the relation of the Old Testament to the New, are presented, with all the array of embarrassments with which human perverseness has invested them, to persons utterly incapable of forming a right judgement upon them, and more likely to pervert than to digest the instruction which the professor communicates.’

Again, the mode in which information was given, namely, by continuous oral delivery, was unsuited to beginners in theology. Their minds were passive; they were only languidly aware, if at all aware, of the real difficulties of the subject.

Another bad result of the German system of exclusively oral teaching, which allows no time for reading and reflection, is very forcibly stated as ‘a character of slavish imitation’ which this system tends generally to produce.

‘There is probably no people among whom the mighty dead are so soon forgotten, or the great names of the present day so unduly exalted, as in Germany, and this because the knowledge of the mass of each generation is derived for the most part *exclusively* from living sources.’

The advantages of the German system, on the other hand, Pusey found in its complete treatment of the field of theological knowledge, and in the living teaching by which the study of standard works ought to be made really fruitful to the student. To the professor, the German division of labour is an advantage, as enabling him to master some one department of theology, instead of contenting himself with a comparatively superficial knowledge of several. Different minds have different capacities, which may be usefully employed in distinct districts of the vast field of theology. Bishop Bull would not have succeeded in writing the ‘Analogy of Religion’; and neither Bull nor Butler would have done the work of Pococke for Hebrew literature.

Germany, then, in Pusey’s opinion, furnished the model of a practical system of instruction, the application of

which to Cathedral institutions would make the latter useful to the Church. If Cathedrals were to survive, he felt that they must be centres of learning and of clerical education. This idea was not a new one: Cranmer had proposed it, but to no purpose, at the period of the Reformation. Pusey contents himself with simply throwing out his suggestion for connecting clerical teaching with Cathedrals. He was afraid, if he said more, of invading the province of those 'who have spiritual authority in the Church.' He purposely leaves undecided such questions as the number of teachers, the duration of teaching, and the size of the proposed colleges; questions which were, as a matter of fact, pretty sure to settle themselves. But he is in favour generally of 'a place which would, as far as possible, provide for the education of the clergy of each diocese within its own precincts,' although he thinks that Peterborough and Bristol may be too small to require a distinct establishment, while other Cathedrals, as St. Paul's, may be, 'from situation, ineligible as places of education.' It was characteristic of Pusey's habit of mind that he was less eager for a dialectical triumph over Lord Henley than to make such use of the controversy as might turn to the permanent advantage of the Church.

The foresight and practical value of this pamphlet have been often recognized; but it contains, here and there, opinions which the author saw reason to modify or recall in later life. For example, he condemns the proposal

'that the general education of the undergraduate members of the University should close at the end of the second year . . . and that the candidates for orders should employ in the exclusive study of divinity the two remaining years of their undergraduate life.'

This proposal was practically adopted by the University when, in the year 1868, the present Final Theological Honour School was established; and in the establishment of that school Pusey took a leading part. But the contradiction is less real than apparent. For some years Pusey was steadily opposed to the project of a Final Theological School, on the ground that it reduced the time which

could be devoted to general education; and he only changed his opinion upon becoming convinced that in the new circumstances of the University, when so much time and enthusiasm was devoted to special, and particularly scientific studies, theology would be 'crushed out of Oxford,' unless this practical recognition of its permanent importance was conceded.

There are popular and important aspects of the work of Cathedrals which have happily become prominent of late years, but which are unrecognized in Pusey's pamphlet. He saw in a Cathedral, sometimes an additional church in a large town, with a succession of well-appointed ministers who may usefully influence its society; sometimes a church in which Divine worship may be conducted with more attention to beauty and order than elsewhere; sometimes an institution in which clerical merit may be appropriately rewarded, and in which, after periods of exhausting labour, its own clergy may find religious refreshment in more tranquil duties, and 'the pure and holy harmony of the choral service.' Of the great duties which a Cathedral owes to the diocese of which it is the mother church, and to the poor, in whose hearts it should find a place as their cherished resort and home, Pusey says nothing. His own Cathedral of Oxford, originally a small monastic church, and now imprisoned within the walls of a college, must remain less capable than others of rendering large service to the spiritual necessities of the people. Such Cathedral experience was not of a character to suggest improvements which would have almost inevitably occurred to him in Bristol or London.

Newman was just about to start for his Mediterranean tour, as the companion of Archdeacon Froude and his son Hurrell, when Pusey sent him the MS. of his pamphlet. It was acknowledged, somewhat hurriedly, from Falmouth, in a letter which led Pusey to change its form, and to make some alterations of inferior moment, such as that of terming Calvin a 'giant' instead of a saint. But the permanent interest of the letter consists in the light which

it throws on the existing relations between two minds which were destined afterwards to such intimate and remarkable association with each other.

THE REV. J. H. NEWMAN TO E. B. P.

MY DEAR PUSEY,

Falmouth, December 5, 1832.

I had hoped to have sent you a line on returning the MS. but difficulties rise with a marvellous fertility when one is going a journey. Indeed I had not time to attend to the MS. itself as I wished. I think your reason for giving all the reasons you can, strong. Certainly a reference book of arguments for things (substantially) as they are is wanted by M.P.'s, &c. I should hope that Peel would be obliged to you—though it is hazardous to speculate about the state of his mind. It would be really a relief to me if I could see grounds for trusting him; and I shall rejoice indeed if I am triumphed over by the event. Indeed, it is altogether a question in my mind whether there *are* many persons who would feel obliged by having arguments for conservation brought before them; most men rather wish excuses for yielding. Nor can I help feeling for them, even while one must abstractedly blame, for the enemy pushes so hard; their difficulty, if they resisted, would be like keeping some selected point of ground to stand on in the midst of a crowd. But, after all, even if things *are* so bad, yet it is true, we ought to tell men what is right, that the fault may not lie with us, if they yield where they should resist.

Yet, though you make a sort of digest, yet, if you do this in a precise form, is it consistent with the notion of addressing a *letter* to Lord H.? and anyhow, you should develop (as you intend) one or two arguments more than the rest. The part you read me seems to me, on second thoughts, too far from the subject *for a letter*, i. e. the remarks about our real ignorance in spite of our conceit, Pascal, &c. Is it not of the nature of an impertinence to dissert and digress in a *letter*? Would it answer your purpose to call it 'Suggestions occasioned by Lord H.'s pamphlet on the real object and use of our Cathedral [Chapter] Institutions'? This would set you far more free, and you could be as civil to Lord H. as you chose still. I am still of opinion that the *great* evil of our want of theological knowledge is its resulting in differences of opinion. Men may say what they will about going by Scripture, not tradition; but nature is stronger than systems. The piety and services of the Primitive Christians add to their authority an influence which is practically irresistible with those, i. e., who are trained in right feelings and habits. And I think this was *intended* by the Author of all truth: and none but Primitive Christianity can bring this about; for other ages, if they have the high spirit yet have not (of course) the authority of the first age. As to Scripture being practically sufficient for making the Christian, it seems to me a mere dream—nor do I find it anywhere said so in Scripture—nor can I infer logically

that what is confessedly *the* sole oracle of *doctrine*, is therefore also of *practice* and *discipline*.

There are some expressions in your MS. I do not like, but I would not (if *you* would) have you alter them, as I rather think they arise from our seeing the truth (as I hope) from somewhat different sides of it, e.g. your use of the word Catholic; still, I do *not* think it a difference of words, I say—so let it pass. Nor should I, in my own views, praise Calvin so highly: i.e. I have nothing to do with him as an individual or as *God's responsible creature*, but as a member of Christ's militant Church, which is a type (not a coincidence with) of the true one, though at the same time an instrument towards, and a probable sign (not a criterion [τεκμήριον]) of it; and, taking things as they are given us, I see in Calvin not a Saint but a Schismatic—a man who at best is in human judgement but *excusable*, and who, *if* a Saint, yet is not displayed to us (as *many* men may not be who are) as such—and I see a man wanting in practical humility, the primary grace. But I say all this, not *wishing* even you should alter it, because I suspect you say what you mean to say—and why should not you?

Even if you give a digest of arguments, avoid all *appearance* of attempting it. Should you not even avoid 1, 2, 3, &c.? for people are sure to number the arguments, if they want them; and to those who do not, *all* the arguments, i.e. a system, is needless, but some only. Do not let the 'Edinburgh' take you up as *a specimen* of Oxford elaborate polemics, &c. 'Here we have an Oxford Professor set forth at the best advantage, a gentleman known, &c.' I almost think it would be better to be rambling, *salvâ dignitate tuâ et rei perspicuitate*, than systematic or didactic.

Nothing more strikes me to say: but I regret I did not ask you to put before me some definite questions to which I was to reply—but perhaps you did, and I have forgotten.

With best and kindest remembrances to Mrs. Pusey, and constant prayers for you,

Ever yours affectionately,

JOHN H. NEWMAN.

Pusey was generally congratulated on the appearance of his pamphlet. The Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Howley, and the Bishop of Durham, Dr. Maltby, expressed their pleasure at it in warm terms, although without committing themselves to approval in detail. Dr. Ireland, then Dean of Westminster, was not less cordial; and Dr. Chalmers, then still a member of the Established Kirk of Scotland, suggested some corrections, and added:—

'It is my earnest hope and prayer that your masterly demonstration may have effect in preserving the Cathedral property for that wise and

high destination which you have so ably pointed out, although I must confess my fears lest every such argument as you employ may well be thrown away on this grossly utilitarian age.'

The pamphlet also met with a favourable reception at the hands of the organs of public opinion¹. It contributed very largely to discredit Lord Henley's well-intentioned but crude proposals; and its ideas and practical suggestions have passed into the general thought of the Church, to take shape in measures which are often attributed to very different sources. If of late years Theological Colleges have been attached to Cathedrals, and if the study of theology has been promoted at such centres and elsewhere by a division of labour, these results are originally due to Pusey's pamphlet.

A second edition of the pamphlet was published within a few months: and it is a much more complete statement of the author's mind on the subject than its predecessor. As was his wont, Pusey embodied suggestions which were made to him by correspondents during the interval; and while his main positions are unchanged, they are fortified by new illustrations and by expanded arguments which add largely to the value of the book. Among several new and striking passages, not the least remarkable is his account of the religious instruction which at that date was given by Oxford to all her students. In many foreign countries, 'theological instruction was confined' to professional students of divinity. In Oxford, 'every student' was required to obtain some knowledge of the evidences of our holy religion, of the Gospels in the original, and of the history of the Acts and of the older Dispensation, and lastly

¹ In October, 1832, the *Edinburgh Review* warmly approved of Lord Henley's scheme, when Pusey's pamphlet had not yet appeared. In *Blackwood*, October, 1833, a writer criticized it very severely, while bestowing great praise on Pusey's pamphlet. The *Quarterly Review* did not notice Pusey's work until Feb. 1837, No. cxv., vol. lviii. p. 197, when it was reviewed with much praise, in connexion with

the Report of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Duties and Revenues. The *British Critic* of course reviewed it favourably (No. xxxv., vol. xviii. p. 224), as 'a work to which we ought long ago to have given the humble tribute of our commendation,' p. 237; and the *British Magazine* had hailed it on its appearance as a 'learned, high-principled, and powerful vindication' of the cathedrals (Feb. 1833).

of the doctrines of our faith, as set forth in our Articles, and proved out of Holy Scripture. Pusey would have had to state his case very differently had he been writing his pamphlet at the present day. Three years and a half afterwards the proposals of the first Cathedral Commission recalled attention to the questions which had been raised by Lord Henley; and Pusey was in correspondence on the subject with Archdeacon Hoare and Mr. Benjamin Harrison. To the latter he writes:—

‘Holton, Sept. 13, 1836.

‘In looking back to my “Remarks,” p. 153 sqq. ed. 2, I was half-surprised to find how much they were directed against this plan, as well as Lord Henley’s. I have very little to add to them, for I feel assured that they would be the basis of a very extensive and efficient reform¹.’

And when writing to the Cathedral Commissioners of 1852, he repeats at length, and with deliberation, the substantial recommendations contained in his pamphlet¹.

Newman wrote from Rome to express a hope that the pamphlet would see the light; apparently he dreaded lest his own criticisms in his Falmouth letter should have prevented a publication which, as the event proved, showed Pusey’s far-sighted appreciation of the needs of the Church at the time. We see in it the first effort, however fragmentary, from Oxford to resist that spirit which it was the whole aim of the Tractarians to oppose. Newman’s letter from Rome is given in full in the Appendix; it is extremely interesting in itself, and is apparently the last communication that passed between the friends before the issue of the earliest numbers of the Oxford ‘Tracts for the Times.’

¹ ‘First Report of H.M. Commissioners appointed Nov. 10, 1852, to inquire into the state and condition of

the Cathedral and Collegiate Churches in England and Wales.’ Answers from Chapters, pp. 787-794.

APPENDIX TO CHAPTER X.

THE REV. E. B. PUSEY TO DR. THOLUCK.

MY DEAR FRIEND,

Christ Church, May 24, 1830.

Your letter arrived very seasonably to prevent further procrastination. For what has passed, I hope that the delay and trouble about my own volume, my lectures, dissertations for my B.D. degree, the labour of correcting the press, and finishing and arranging indices to our lost friend Dr. Nicoll's Catalogue, &c., &c., with my ignorance of the form in which my communication had best be put, will furnish my excuse. I will endeavour for any future information which you may wish, to be more regular. I hope that you will not be disappointed at what I have sent. I have attempted to give you an outline of what has been done since the beginning of this century, and to characterize each book briefly. I will endeavour to give you a fuller account of any about which you may wish for more particulars, if you will name them to me. I fear the statement is very dry: I would gladly have enlivened [it] by extracts or fuller observations, but thought that they would be too long for your purpose. I have attempted to combine with this account of what has been *done* lately, some idea of the books which our clergy employ (which I understood that you wished to know).

I will not fail to send you an account of the new translation of the Psalms, if you like it, as soon as it appears. I should, of course, wish you to mould the information which I have sent you (if you can make any use of it) in any manner you please, but I should *like* something of the apology for our modern divines in page 1 to stand; but do as suits you best. I should be very ready to write this whole statement over again if you will tell me how it may be better made to suit you.

You will be glad to hear that my controversy with Mr. Rose is at an end—at least he writes me word that he does not intend to answer my volume. It is a heterogeneous and disproportioned mass, but the nature of my defence compelled me to neglect everything like order. I have been obliged in the preface to notice the notes from your lectures, but only to say that as they were taken by a student from your *oral* lectures you could not be responsible for anything in them. Mr. Rose brought the matter before the public.

I will send you a copy of the remaining portion of poor Nicoll's

Catalogue as soon as it appears, as there may be some things in it which you may be glad to see. I have asked my friend Jelf to forward my volume to you.

God be with you and prosper all your attempts for the good of His Church.

Ever your sincere friend,

E. B. PUSEY.

STATEMENT ENCLOSED IN LETTER FROM REV. E. B. PUSEY
TO DR. THOLUCK, OF MAY 24, 1830.

MY DEAR FRIEND,

Before I attempt in any degree to answer your inquiry as to what has been recently done in English theology I ought to premise a few observations in explanation of the paucity of books which I shall have to produce. This you will allow me in excuse for the divines of my country who might otherwise be exposed to an unmerited charge of indolence. The points of difference between our two countries are indeed such as you would be aware of. They appear to me to consist (1) in the predominant practical character of our nation, (2) the previous state of our respective theologies, and (3) the different condition of our Universities. You will doubtless have observed that few, if any, of our writings have originated in an abstract love of investigation; our greatest and some immortal works have arisen in some exigencies of the times; the writings of Chillingworth, Hooker, Butler, Bull (and so of the rest) were written not merely to solve problems of importance in themselves, but such as the good of the Church in our country at that time required. Hence it will be that in times when the exigency is less pressing little will be produced; the materials are very probably collected, the knowledge is more or less in circulation, but it is not published unless circumstances call it forth. A German writes because he has something to say; an Englishman only because it is, or he thinks it is, needed. This affects naturally the subjects also upon which we write; at one time there would be a number of controversial writings, at another innumerable books on evidences, &c. The necessity which there is to provide at present for the lower orders, whose appetite for knowledge of all sorts has of late been very unhealthily excited, requires the employment of a good deal of the exertion of our clergy in popular works. On the second point, the previous state of our theology, I may observe freely that as in our Church so large a scholastic system never existed as in the Lutheran after the Formula of Concord, our old divines are naturally more useful to us than yours, now that the system even of the orthodox among you is so much changed, can be. I do not of course mean to speak of Luther and the mighty heroes of your Reformation, or of such men as Gerard—these must be loved and valued wherever there is Christian piety; yet

I cannot but think that in consequence of your fettering systems you have far fewer works from which you can now derive benefit than we. Personal peculiarities have again their influence here also : we, if we come upon the whole with a book, admire its spirit and feel its value, and we continue to study it in its original form, although from change of circumstances and opinions much may no longer correspond with our views ; you, if I mistake not, are generally disposed to recast it. Hence perhaps arise a number of new books among you, which are new only as to the name of the author, but the main substance of which has been long before the public. With far fewer books I suspect we have had far more original writers. Our great writers may again have had the same effect here as Newton had upon mathematical science—that, content with what he had done, none thought of further progress.

The last point is the state of our Universities and the Church. This is in many ways unfavourable to the production of scientific works. The stimulus which is given among you to publication by your *written* lectures is almost entirely wanting ; for instruction being here given almost exclusively catechetically, not even the basis is thus laid for future publications. Again, the great mass of clergy collected in our Universities are almost entirely engaged in providing *general*, not in *special* education : religious and theological instruction is indeed generally given ; there is however but little distinct theological instruction. Our preparatory education lasts in general until twenty-one, after that few are willing, since not compelled, to remain longer. We have, moreover, including the Hebrew Professors, but six¹ theological Professors in England : among these also, except in the case of the Hebrew Professor, there is no division of labour : none has any particular line to which he may devote himself. The effect has been that we know only of *four* works in the last thirty years which have been the result of theological lectures. The enormous increase of our population, on the other hand, has enlarged to such a degree the duties of the practical clergy that neither the ordinary clergy nor the bishops have much leisure for theological works ; the canonries, &c., which might furnish a provision for scientific theologians, are very generally united with livings of large labour but slender provision. We have therefore none among us corresponding to the class of theologians at your Universities, whose daily employment leads them on to those exertions which they may become a blessing to after ages. What is done among ourselves is effected for the most part against unfavourable circumstances.

In attempting to give a statement of what has been done in the thirty years, it will perhaps be best first to give a general outline,

¹ The Professorships of Ecclesiastical History and Pastoral Theology at Oxford were founded in 1842, Dean

Ireland's Professorship of Exegesis in 1847, the Oriel Professorship of Interpretation in 1882.

and hereafter to fill up some of the details with regard to the more interesting. In Ecclesiastical History you will be prepared to expect that little has been done. Two divisions are however beginning to be cultivated, both perhaps in reference to the contests with the Roman Church, which have been lately renewed amongst us—the history, namely, of our own Reformation and that of the Early Church. The former has been occasioned by the untrue statements of Lingard and other late writers of his confession. These have produced some interesting vindications of the characters of our Reformers, especially Cranmer. Two histories of our Reformation have lately appeared, by ✓ Soames and Carwithen, both of them diligent and accurate relaters of fact. The former has employed much research, and the substance of his present Bampton Lecture on the ‘Doctrines of the Anglo-Saxon Church’ will throw much additional light on the religious system of our early Church.

I have often regretted that your countrymen are not better acquainted with our history: it is often despatched much too summarily, as a work in which state-policy was the principal agent; and one of the great proofs of the power of true Christianity to recover itself from the degradation, into which by man’s corruption it may sink, is thereby lost. There is abundant proof that the Reformation amongst us also won early the affections of many among both clergy and people, that it was produced by the need of pure Christianity. The other division of Ecclesiastical History has begun to be cultivated at once at both Universities: much more will probably be done in a short time. At Cambridge, Bishop Kaye has already published ‘Illustrations of the Ecclesiastical History of the second and third centuries from Tertullian,’ and ‘An Account of the Writings and Opinions of Justin Martyr’: and it is understood that these are but the commencement of a larger series. He has employed much diligence in the work on Tertullian; and although it is somewhat embarrassed by an adherence to Mosheim’s subdivisions, and still more by the arrangement of the enquiry into the doctrines of the Church under the head of the Thirty-nine Articles, it will be an useful analysis of Tertullian, and will probably give life to the study of the Fathers amongst us. I regret that it is, perhaps generally, too mere an analysis: that, though clearly written, there is not much definiteness of thought: it is, as indeed it professes to be, rather the exploring of a mine, than a *Bearbeitung* of the treasures obtained. The work on Justin is necessarily short, but it is better arranged. It contains a brief account of the works of that Father, i.e. the two Apologies and the Dial. c. Tryph. (the λόγος παραινετικός he rejects), his doctrines, the condition of the Christians and the causes of the rapid extension of Christianity. He discusses also the question whether the ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων be the gospels, which he decides in the affirmative (without reference to Winer, whose Essay had not appeared when this was written), and briefly notices Tatian and Athenagoras.

Dr. Routh's collection of the fragments of the Ante-Nicene Fathers, in his '*Reliquiae Sacrae*,' I need scarcely have mentioned, but that it seems scarcely to have been sufficiently known in G[ermany]. (I have at least been surprised to find no notice taken of a valuable testimony to the canon in a fragment of the second century, which he has republished in it corrected from Muratori.) There is but little published for the first time in these volumes, but he has rendered good service by collecting together all these '*disjecta membra*,' he has added very large and learned (perhaps too copious) notes, and has, where necessary, happily restored the text. We have also had lately from Dr. Burton (the present Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford) a learned statement of the heresies of the Apostolic Age (Bampton Lectures) (intended to illustrate allusions in the N. T.) and '*Testimonies of the Ante-Nicene Fathers to the Divinity of Christ*.' This last, however, belongs rather to doctrinal theology. An interesting history of the allegorical interpretation of Holy Scripture from Philo through the Christian Fathers has been published by Conybeare (Bampton Lectures), but again giving facts rather than results. We may, however, I hope expect much more, and especially some improved editions of the earlier Fathers, within the next few years. The stimulus has been given, our Church's need pointed out. Of what is being done for the history of the Eastern Churches, by members of the Oriental Translation Society (as in the publication of the '*Chronicle of Elias of Nisibis*' by Mr. Forshall, and the Apostolic Constitutions of the Aethiopic Church by Mr. Platt), you are probably aware. Neither are yet in the press.

For the history of God's earlier people, something has been done by Russell: who is filling up the interval left by the works of Shuckford and Prideaux (Shuckford began from the commencement of *primaeval* history, but did not carry it on to meet Prideaux) with the same object of exhibiting it in connexion with that of the people with whom the Jews came in contact. I hope that then the whole will be redone, for Shuckford's work is full of fanciful and untenable theories. Russell's, of which a portion only is executed, is done with judgement. I ought also to mention a work which, though in a popular form, is the result of some research, and in which the Eastern travellers are extensively employed,—Milman's '*History of the Jews*' (3 vols. anonymous in the Family Library). I must mention it the rather because, from exaggerated statements of it, you might suppose that one portion of Rationalism was finding its way amongst us. The author is very far from Rationalism, and had before in his Bampton Lectures cultivated an additional portion of the vast field of the evidences for the truth of Christianity. Like so many other writers on evidence, however, his main object has become rather to convince the sceptic, than to instruct those who already believe, and therefore the work was unfitted for a family library. In his anxiety moreover to present the events in their full vividness, as they would appear to a bystander, he has sometimes spoken as if the agents on the scene were the sole agents. He seems

also to have had a confused notion of the share which Moses individually had in the office of guiding and legislating for God's people. Proceeding from the right principle that God would select such agents as were best fitted to execute His designs, he has at times appeared to speak of Moses rather as the able instrument of Providence than as the inspired agent of God. (I say 'appeared' because there is no doubt that the author is a sincere believer in the O. T. revelation.) The most radical defect, however, appears to me, that in his anxiety to gain the attention of readers who neglect or doubt of the O. T., he has given too much an external history of the Jewish nation, instead of contemplating them in reference to God's designs, in selecting them as His people. The miraculous events which he relates undoubtingly are thus out of keeping, and, I fear, that compromising spirit indulged which seeks to make religion palatable instead of useful, to bring it down to our tastes and feelings instead of correcting them by it. No one would certainly more regret this than the author of that work, but I fear such may in some degree be the effect. The portions, however, which have given most offence in his volumes are those which he has written with reference to the Neologist solutions of Miracles; in many cases he adopts the supposition that natural cause formed the substratum of the miracle, but not to the exclusion of Divine agency. We are, however, too unaccustomed to such solutions, not to be alarmed at them: a controversy has in consequence been commenced: and much as I regret the appearance of this work, I dread yet more from exaggerated and indiscriminating censures of it. The *Darstellung* of the book, and indeed its whole external character, is vivid and good: it points out also here and there some good internal evidence for the antiquity and genuineness of the Pentateuch. In the third volume, which contains the later history of the Jews, the author says that he has much used Jost ('*Gesch. d. Israeliten*').

Evidences. On this subject the older books are generally used, especially the immortal Butler, and Paley's works: with these are joined Abbadie, Grotius, Pascal. For the genuineness of the N. T. Lardner or Less. On these subjects there have been no new systematic works, although innumerable popular ones, for all classes of readers. Detached points have, however, been treated. Sumner (the present Bishop of Chester) has in his '*Evidences*' touched well upon some of the peculiarities of Christianity. The parts relating to historical evidence are but very indifferent: those, however, relating to the 'originality of the Christian doctrines and character,' the peculiar language of the Christian Scriptures and their agreement with subsequent experience, are well executed. It supplies a desideratum in so many books of evidence, in that it interests the affections, while it produces the proof. The main medium of proof proposed is that 'a religion like the Christian would never have been received, had it not been introduced by Divine authority.' Other points are also well cleared in Whately's '*Peculiarities of the Christian Revelation*,' which is

a very interesting and excellent book. Chalmers' 'Evidence of the Christian Revelation,' though diffuse, is a clear popular book. Milman's Bampton Lectures on the 'Character and Conduct of the Apostles,' considered as an evidence of Christianity, develops some points well from the history of the Acts, but is of course considered as supplementary only. Daniel Wilson's 'Evidences' (which are just published) are said to be a diligent and good compilation of all which has been written by others, but I have not yet seen them. Dean Ireland's 'Comparison of Paganism and Christianity,' 1809, is the work of a good scholar and divine. It was written for a 'Hohe Schule.' The most original work, however, produced lately, is on one portion of Christian evidence, Davison 'On the Structure, Use, and Inspiration of Prophecy,' 1824-5. The divisions of the work are (1) the connexion of prophecy with the other evidences; (2) the prophets as moral teachers (i. e. in their ministerial duties towards their contemporaries); (3) the character of *prophecy* in relation to the several periods in which it was delivered; (4) tests of the inspiration of prophecy and application in particular instances (of which the best executed is its reference to Christianity). The last of these is of course the only part strictly 'apologetic': in the 3rd, the inspiration of prophecy is for the most part assumed, the question proposed being, what were its order, uses, information, when given. The question is one for those who already believe on other grounds, and wish to know 'the order and tenour of that Revelation which they believe.' Indications of truth are occasionally observed, and it is this portion of the work which is most original and which I liked the best. A German would probably be surprised at several lesser things in this work, as the assumption of a prophecy of Enoch, the absence of any critical enquiries into the date of the several books, &c., &c.: nor is there much (or that valuable) Hebrew criticism. It is the work, however, of a powerful and independent mind, and, setting aside petty imperfections, will well repay the study.

On the genuineness of individual books, there is much well done in Graves' 'Lectures on the Pentateuch,' which, however, requires much sifting (but of this you have a translation), and in the 'Credibility of the Mosaic Records,' which forms the first part of Sumner's 'Records of the Creation.' The best parts of this again are those on the originality of the Jewish system, on the object and design of the polity,—on the religious opinions and religious worship.

A 'History of Unbelief' has also been given by Bishop Van Mildert in his Boyle Lectures. His object in the first volume of these is to trace the prophetic denunciation, that there should be enmity between the author of evil and the seed of the woman in all stages of his existence, and that on that very account there is nothing alarming in the phenomenon that the denunciation bears with it the promise also. He traces unbelief accordingly in the first volume, in early heathenism, in Jewish and heathen opposition to Christianity, Mohammedanism as well as in modern infidelity; of which he gives an account down to

the French Revolution. His second volume is occupied by the consideration of the several objections to Revelation, divided into the *à priori* and *à posteriori*. His notes furnish a copious, but well-selected, body of authorities. He is regarded as one of the most judicious writers of our day.

I may mention also under this head, Forster's 'Mohammedanism Unveiled,' an attempt to account for the rise and success of Mohammedanism. The first idea of the writer was good, to consider it as one great link in God's designs as an intermediate stage between heathenism and Christianity. The author has, however, unfortunately allowed himself to be involved in pseudo-literal interpretations of prophecy; and the great subject of his book has been to compare the accomplishment of the *promise* to Ishmael (of which he regards Mohammedanism as the crown) with that of Isaac. The analogies or the contrasts are pursued in wearisome and absurd minuteness, and the interpretation is a travesty of this and other prophecy. His system, however, has induced him to state the difficulties of the origin of Mohammedanism more fairly than I have elsewhere seen. The author has diligently used the researches of other writers, but probably does not understand Arabic sufficiently to go to original sources. Professor Lee's valuable controversial tracts you know.

Scriptural Interpretation and Criticism. On these subjects little has been done. For the understanding of the Scripture, we use principally our and your older authors, with a few more modern. Some epitomes we have had, as by Blomfield and others (of little value), but scarcely any on distinct books, since Lowth, Blayney on Jeremiah and Zechariah, and Newcome on Ezekiel and the Minor Prophets (the last two about the end of the last century). The books employed ordinarily by the clergy are the series by Patrick, W. Lowth, Arnald, and Whitby, with Hammond and Clark's Paraphrase on the Gospels and Pyle's on the Epistles. Those who have more leisure and means employ the whole range. Of the Fathers, Chrysostom and Theophylact are principally used. Bishop Horsley, whom you know probably as the acute opponent of the Socinian Priestley, published a translation of the Psalms, and some detached criticisms on the Historical Books, and some of the Prophets, especially Hosea, were published after his death by his son. With great acuteness, however, he was too rash a critic, too much of the conjectural school, and a Hutchinsonian. He has not added much to our store. A great deal is expected, however, from a translation of the Psalms by Dr. Friend, of Cambridge, who has the reputation of being a good Orientalist, and whose work is expected soon. In the New Testament, Dean Woodhouse's 'Commentary on the Apocalypse' is, by the spirituality of its interpretation, a happy exception to the pseudo-literal interpretation with which our unlearned press has so long swarmed, and which brings such sad disparagement upon prophecy. Dean Woodhouse has also produced some additional evidence of the genuineness of the Apocalypse. Individual passages

have been ably vindicated against the Unitarians by Archbishop Laurence and Magee, Dr. Nares, and Mr. Rennell in the answers to the Unitarian version. There are also some good expositions in Bishop Blomfield's 'Lectures on the Acts of the Apostles,' although a popular work. For critical introductions to the Bible, scarcely anything has been done since Marsh's 'Notes on Michaelis.' In the New Testament Hug has been translated, but the translator, Dr. Wait, a good Oriental scholar, was unfortunately prevented from bestowing the pains necessary to correct Hug's inaccuracies. Dr. Wait has accordingly pointed out a few only of these or of Hug's strained theories; his notes are chiefly on the second volume, and consist principally of illustrations from Jewish or Eastern antiquities, of little importance to the object of the work. Dr. Wait was also too little acquainted with German for his task. In the first volume are some few corrections of the account of the Bashmuri version¹, and a letter from Professor Lee is inserted, noticing Hug's mistakes in his brief account of Lee's edition of the Syriac New Testament, and Henderson's 'Biblical Researches' are referred to for a better account of the Slavonic, and for the Servian and Georgian. Lee is preparing his collation of all the Syrian MSS. of the N. T. in England, to be published by the Oriental Translation Society. The translator of Schleiermacher's 'Essay on St. Luke' has prefixed to that work a clear and critical analysis of the theories on the origin of the first three Gospels since the time of Michaelis, including one by a very pious and excellent Englishman, Veysie's 'Examination of Mr. Marsh's Hypothesis,' respecting the origin of the first three Gospels, 1808. It is singular that (according to this author, for this essay of Veysie's is very difficult to procure, and I have scarcely seen it) Veysie's general theory is the same as Schleiermacher's, i.e. that the Evangelists employed *several* written documents, though he differs from him in 'supposing all the narratives which compose the Gospels to have been derived immediately from the Apostles, and in his application of the theory.' This indeed is, I imagine, likely to be the predominant opinion in England, that the discourses namely and actions of our Saviour were put into writing and circulated among the first Christians, and collected in different degrees of fullness; that the first three Evangelists employed these collections for their specific purposes in writing the Gospels. The old theory, however, of the employment of St. Matthew's Gospel by St. Mark, and both these by St. Luke, has lately been maintained in a work of considerable learning (which I have not yet had leisure to study), Greswell's 'Harmony of the Evangelists' (Oxford, 1830). This writer has drawn entirely from original sources, and his work is said to be one of very great research, but full of digressions; and his not using other authors is said to have occasioned him to discuss at great length points which have long been settled. But of this work I must give you a fuller account hereafter. I should have

¹ Cf. Hug's Introduction, tr. Wait, vol. i. pp. 419, 420.

mentioned that Bishop Marsh has published a set of lectures on the criticism and interpretation of the Bible, but having been addressed to younger students of theology they are elementary only. Griesbach's system of recensions is generally employed in this country, but not received by scholars. Bishop Marsh only acquiesces in it as the best hitherto given; Professor Gaisford, our eminent Greek scholar, rejects it. Nothing has however appeared against it but a work by Nolan, 'Inquiry into the Integrity of the Received Text of the New Testament,' pp. 576 (1815). In this elaborate defence of the received text, he endeavours to establish the superior authority of the Byzantine text, and of the Brescia MS. of the Itala; but his theory rests on some very precarious assumptions, especially on a supposed wilful corruption of the text by Eusebius. The work however has much learning, and he candidly acknowledges Griesbach's merits.

On the criticism of the Old Testament nothing has been done lately but a republication of Walton's Prolegomena with Dathe's observations, and an epitome of a few other dissertations, with some few notes furnished by Professor Lee, &c.

Doctrinal Theology. You are aware that we have no division corresponding to your systematic theology, and that our 'dogmatik' consists, for the most part, of illustrations and commentaries on the Creeds and Articles: as, among the old and still far the best, Jackson, and King and Pearson on the Creed, Burnet on the Thirty-nine Articles, &c., and these, with the works of Bull and Waterland, are principally studied. Scott's 'Christian Life' however (still much recommended and studied) contains the best systematic statement of Christian doctrine. Our old sermon writers also, as Andrewes, Allestree, Taylor, Faringdon, &c., contain a rich body of Christian doctrine poured forth from the fullness of the heart. What has been lately done has originated in our several controversies with the Anti-Trinitarians, Romanists, and Calvinists. Against the Anti-Trinitarians the principal works (besides those already alluded to in the exposition of Scripture) have been Archbishop Magee's 'Dissertations on the Scriptural Doctrines of Atonement and Sacrifice,' and Dr. Burton's work already mentioned. Archbishop Magee's work, with much of merely local interest, is replete with very extensive learning and of great acuteness, but unfortunately so miserably arranged as to defy analysis; and amid the occupations of his diocese he has not yet been able to revise it. It consists of three octavo volumes of Illustration of Dissertations explanatory of two sermons, consisting only of sixty-five pages. Dr. Burton's work is the result of a long and accurate study of the Ante-Nicene Fathers. The general order of the work is that of time: after a slight account of each Father, the strongest passages in proof of his belief in our Saviour's Divinity are given, and briefly commented upon; occasionally however passages of different Fathers are brought together with reference to particular expressions, or texts whose reading or interpretation is disputed. I may mention, as a caution against taking Griesbach's dicta

too implicitly, that Dr. B. shows his assertion 'antiquiores patres, et *inter hos vel ipse Athanasius c. Apollinar.* in S. literis αἷμα Θεοῦ legi negaverunt' to be utterly unfounded: Athanasius says on the contrary, I. c., οὐδαμοῦ δὲ αἷμα Θεοῦ δίχα σαρκὸς παραδεδώκασιν αἱ γραφαί, and adds, αἱ δὲ γραφαὶ ἐν σαρκὶ Θεοῦ καὶ σαρκὸς Θεοῦ ἀνθρώπου γενομένου αἷμα καὶ πάρος καὶ ἀνάστασιν κηρύττουσι σώματος Θεοῦ. The vagueness of the rest of Griesbach's assertions evinces that he knew of no other Father who used the expression which he ascribed to Athanasius, and Dr. B. shows that they do frequently use the phrase (so much stronger than in the Acts, since used directly instead of indirectly) αἷμα Θεοῦ. He takes this opportunity also of showing that no argument can be drawn from the quotation 'Domini' in Irenaeus, since it can be proved that in other places (where the Greek remains) the translator observes also that not only the Vatican but the oldest MSS. of the Syr. (collated by Professor Lee) have the reading Θεοῦ. As Dr. B.'s argument is only directed against our modern Anti-Trinitarians, he does not enter into the questions of the systems of the Fathers on the Trinity, but only produces the passages which show that they regarded our Saviour as Very God. It is a clear and accurate book. I ought perhaps also to mention the work of a learned Dissenter, Dr. Pye Smith, 'Scripture Testimony to the Messiah' (second edition, 1821). But though a work of much learning (and the author is even acquainted with many of the modern German divines) he has unfortunately admitted (and particularly in the early part) so many weak grounds that the work requires very great sifting, and is rather calculated, unless it fall into judicious hands, to excite suspicion than to produce conviction. I need only mention that with your divines of the seventeenth century, he argues from Gen. iv. 1, 26, Isaiah lxiii. 1-7, Job xix. 23-27. Bating however these defects, there is much and laborious investigation.

The late Bishop Heber published as a young divine his Bampton Lectures 'On the Personality of the Holy Spirit.' They are, as you would expect of everything from that excellent man, pious and able; but he was thought to have chosen a subject above his years, and to have indulged his imagination too much.

In the controversy with the Romanists you know probably of Marsh's 'Comparative View of Romanism and Protestantism,' which has been translated into German, as well as Blanco White's 'Internal Evidence against Catholicism.'

In the controversy with the Calvinists, the principal books are Laurence, 'Bampton Lectures on the Articles of the Church of England, falsely called Calvinistic,' a learned book, and Copleston, 'On Predestination,' a book of much acuteness. Sumner's 'Apostolical Preaching' is an enquiry into the mode in which the Apostles treated on the subjects now controverted, in their teaching, in reference to a high tone of Calvinistic preaching, which had produced secession from our Church—pious, candid, mild; and Whately's 'Difficulties of

St. Paul' presents a clear statement of the Apostle's doctrines on the same subject. It was intended for those who abstained from the study of St. Paul, on account of its supposed difficulties (a habit too prevalent among many younger clergy).

I have now sent you, as far as my memory and library furnish me, an account of our more recent English works ; some I am conscious of having omitted, not being sufficiently acquainted with their character ; others I have probably overlooked. It will however sufficiently show you the present direction of our theological literature, and an additional list of books would only have rendered it more dry, as I could not here enter much into detail. Like all other charts, the account must consist too much of outline ; I shall be glad however to fill out any portion of it, by individual traits, when you will point out the parts on which you would wish for more detail. God prosper His cause among you, and unite at least the members of our two Churches in the Spirit of His Son.

I ought to have mentioned under the head of 'Ecclesiastical History' a translation of Spanheim ; and two original works by MacCrie, histories of the Reformation in Spain and Italy. He has brought a good deal of information of the extent to which the reformed doctrines prevailed in those countries, and they are interesting works, although he has given far too much of the horrible details of the Inquisition.

I should perhaps also have named illustrations of the Scriptures from Oriental sources. Burder's book has been for some time translated by Rosenmüller ; besides this Dr. Wait has written a small volume of Oriental and Classical customs, and Jennings' Lectures on Godwin's Moses and Aaron, containing considerable additions, has been published since his death.

THE REV. J. H. NEWMAN TO REV. E. B. PUSEY.

MY DEAR PUSEY,

Rome, March 19, 1833.

We did not hear of the result of the elections till the end of January, nor of the hard struggle in which your brother was engaged till yesterday. Miserable as the result has been, I do not know how gentlemen of county influence could have answered to their consciences had they not made the effort. Now the course of things is in the hands of a higher Power—and though all holy interests and the cause of the Church seem to lie at the mercy of bad men who have not the faith, yet we know the triumphing of the wicked is short. No good ever came (to speak as a man) from seizing on consecrated things : this spoliation scheme of the present Ministers must fall on their own heads and on their children after them, and it seems almost like a judicial blindness that they do not see this merely by a worldly sagacity.

We heard from Keble two days since—and heard of Arnold's plan of Church Reform—but nothing of your pamphlet, by which I suppose you have changed your mind about publishing, and I am sorry you have had cause to do so (if so). I believe much harm has come from many publications on the subject; but could not possibly from yours to interfere with its good. The men in power seem to have for the most part taken whatever Churchmen have suggested, as so much admitted—and taken *all* their admissions and thrown them together. E.g. unluckily Burton's, whose error surely was that of not understanding the age and the persons with whom he had to deal. We have just learnt that Lord Althorp promises an English Church Reform this Session; a fresh bribe I suppose to enable the Ministers to pass the Coercion Bill. If we hear right accounts of Arnold's pamphlet, he is opening the door to alterations in *doctrine* some day to come. How fast events are going. Who knows what place we shall hold this time two or three years? But it is the case with the Church all over the world, apparently—here, and in Sicily, as in England: and though we shall not live to see it, can we doubt that it is intended to effect the pacification of that divinely-founded body, for its edification in love, and for the re-union to it of those well-meaning but mistaken dissentients who at present cause so great a scandal? By no means short of some terrible convulsion and through much suffering can this Roman Church surely be reformed; nothing short of great suffering, as by fire, can melt us together in England one with another. What a strange light does it cast on the prophecies of the N. T. to observe the curious connexion between the floating notions thence derived of what is to come and the present state of the world! In spite of all discrepancies and extravagances of interpretation, there are general outlines, which scarcely can have been taken *from* the actual face of things and yet agree with it; e.g. Scott, I think, in his Bible lays it down distinctly that a last persecution was coming over the Christian world. He wrote this thirty or forty years since; and it seems to have been the notion of his day. Doubtless the first French Revolution turned men's minds that way: yet that woe apparently was over—and peace restored—but the tradition continued, and now, one may suppose, is in the course of accomplishment. This reflection leads one to look at the book of Revelations (*sic*) with much awe—as an oracle which could speak to us if it chose—and which has sent out already certain brief and partially obscure, yet partially determinate sounds, to show us that it is divine. I wish I could make up my mind whether the 1,260 years of Captivity begin with Constantine—it seems a remarkable coincidence that its termination should fall about on the Reformation—(I speak from memory) which, amid good, has been the source of all the infidelity, the second woe, which is now overspreading the earth. Perhaps it has different accomplishments, as the seventy years of Jewish captivity. I see no reason to call Constantine's establishment of the Church a happy event (except so far as that good follows everything).

He was the patron of Arianism, and Constantius after him—thus the Gospel was set up in heresy, and a secular spirit went with it: as the history shows. The Church was in persecution in the reigns of Constantine, Constantius, and Valens. Under Theodosius the Arians *conformed* to orthodoxy and corrupted the Catholics.

It has struck me whether we ought not to take the main object of the Revelations (putting aside the three first chapters as distinct) to be that of prophesying the destiny of the Roman city and empire, without direct reference to the question whether they are Pagan or Christian, merely as secular and so ungodly. Then I would argue or investigate thus. Other cities doomed in Scripture, as Babylon, have totally perished—Rome still survives—qu. then whether the prophecies about the place, as a place, are yet fully accomplished? for that Rome is meant in Rev. 17 and 18, there can be no doubt. Further, Rome is expressly one of the four great enemies of God, the monsters of Daniel's vision—the other three have come to an end: you cannot point to the vestiges of their power, the respective seats of their empire are obliterated—but Rome still remains, though the worst and most ungodly of them. Let it be considered too whether Daniel does not evidently signify the continuation of the sway of Rome, and the tardiness and gradual nature of its destruction in a way which would lead us to suppose that its judgements as a local temple and seat of evil were not over with the first burst when the Empire fell. Still further, look at the structure of the Revelations—assuming it chiefly is concerned with the judgements on the Roman state and city. You first have (ch. vi.) a climax of six judgements arranged (so to say) scenically, apparently cumulative, and ending in a new order of things: then there is a pause; the object of punishment survives, for its judgements are continued in the subsequent chapters, but they are few and slowly executed (vid. vii. 3, viii. 1), with the exception of a second burst, viii. 5–13. Lastly, can there be a doubt from ch. xviii. (which is by its position also pointed out to be subsequent to the former judgements, but waiving this) that at length the doom of Rome will be overwhelming and final, a catastrophe which certainly has not yet come? vid. xviii. 21, and cf. Jer. li. 63, 64, and Rev. xix. 3; cf. Is. xxxiv. 10. (Qu. would the prophecies against Jerusalem be an objection to this view, Jerusalem being still a city?) On the other hand, turning from prophecy to history, what do we see in matter of fact? The Roman territory was desolated by a series of woes till it was broken up by a great revolution. A second series succeeded in the invasions and settlement of the Northern nations. Since that time (after an interval) its South (Africa and Syria) has been occupied by the Saracens. After a second interval its East by the Turks—and now after a third the huge Russian power, ever exterior to the Roman Empire, seems to overhang it like a cloud, and to threaten all that remains of it. Meanwhile, as a body, it remains more or less entire. The Roman titles have been preserved, Caesar, Emperor, &c., and the assumptions

they involve. Rome too, as a city, still claims universal obedience to its sway, even in the Eastern Empire, i.e. appointing Patriarchs, &c. ; it still maintains its old language as the medium of intercourse between its parts, which is thus its language *as* an Empire : it is still remarkable for that one talent, which the Romans had, *the political*, so that with no exaggeration we may say the crafty spirit, whether of the Republic or of the Caesars, still lives—and, looking at its religion, still has the same (identical) rites, its polytheistic worship, &c. Now in this mode of considering the subject, I dismiss the subject of Antichrist, and the difference of Pagan and Christian Rome, altogether. If the persecuting ungodly spirit of the Iron Monster has clutched hold of and corrupted the Church, making use of it as a medium of its sorceries, is another point. If so, undoubtedly the Church too so far will suffer ; but for this part of the subject I would rather turn to St. Paul's Epistles, 2 Thess. ii., &c. ; but I mean that St. John is concerned with Rome as an existing place, and seat of rule, and thus completes what Daniel has left. Moreover, while I am theorizing, let me suggest, that, just as St. John expands the distant horizon which Daniel hinted at in but a few words, so the latter part (e.g. xix. 11–15) may contain the events of hundreds or thousands of years. I say this to answer the objection of the prophecies of the book having mainly to do with the Roman Empire ; Asia, Africa, the Americas, and New Holland being unnoticed ; and I would parallel it by the first chapter of Genesis, where an indefinitely long period (in which we are not concerned) may be summed up in each of the first verses.

I daresay you will (rightly) criticize the details of the above, as being in part old, and in part merely ingenious—yet qu. whether the main idea is not worth considering, that Rome, as a city, the Rome of Daniel and the Gospels, has not yet drank out the fullness of judgement destined for her : so that the blood of the martyrs which was shed on her soil rather cries out against her, than hallows her. It is most melancholy, with a feeling of this kind to look upon this beautiful city ; yet there were goodly stones in the Temple at Jerusalem, nor am I pronouncing anything against individuals in it, nor even against the Church in it, as such, necessarily, for all Christians are addressed (as the believing Jews were) Rev. xviii. 4, when the time of vengeance comes, to retire from her. But of course it is a question whether the Pope, as the secular supreme power, is not implicated ; and who can say that the dissolution of the tie which exists between the Spouse of Christ and the Tyrant Spirit of old Rome which has enslaved her will not cost some vast suffering to the captive party ? How is the parable of the Tares fulfilled here !

We are much pleased with Mr. Bunsen, though (to speak in confidence) I think he has not seen enough of the world ; this seems a strange assertion, but he seems to me somewhat bigoted to views *very* good in the main, but requiring in detail modifications, which he has never had the opportunity of entering into. It is curious to

me to see a man somewhat of a *don* (though a *most kind* one) out of Oxford. Certainly travelling has not diminished my respect for home authorities. Narrowness of mind is no peculiar gift of the cloister. This *entre nous*.

With kindest remembrances to Mrs. Pusey, and all good wishes to you and yours,

Ever yours affectionately,

J. H. NEWMAN.

CHAPTER XI.

RISE OF THE OXFORD MOVEMENT—REACTION FROM EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY THOUGHT—WALTER SCOTT—COLERIDGE — THE EVANGELICAL MOVEMENT — DR. SIKES—JOSHUA WATSON—ALEXANDER KNOX—HUGH JAMES ROSE—REVOLUTIONARY ECCLESIASTICAL PROPOSALS—THE HADLEIGH CONFERENCE—THE ‘FRIENDS OF THE CHURCH’—THE TRACTS—KEBLE—NEWMAN—PUSEY.

THE great movement of religious thought and life named after the Tracts, which were its earliest product and very largely its directing influence, first began in Oxford during the summer of 1833. It may be a material help to trace here some of its many antecedents. To no small degree it was a result of the reaction from the encyclopedist or negative temper which had preceded and created the great French Revolution, and had been felt in every country in Europe. When the floodgates of human passion had been opened on a gigantic scale in the horrors of war and anarchy, men felt that religion and a clear, strong, positive religious creed was necessary, if civilization was to be saved from ruin. This conviction inspired writers like Chateaubriand and Frayssinous in France; and it was the soul of the struggle against the older Rationalism in Protestant Germany. It acquired a new intensity in the eventful months which followed on the death of George IV. The three days of July 1830 in Paris, and the wide popular agitations in this country, culminating in the Bristol riots, which preceded the passing of the first Reform Bill, appeared to contemporaries to threaten a renewal, perhaps on another scene, of the Days of the Terror, and revived and deepened the convictions with which religious English-

men like Burke or Bishop Horne had regarded the work of Marat and Robespierre.

Of this reaction one element was a new interest in the middle ages, which the literary men of the eighteenth century had agreed to denounce with a violence which was only greater than their ignorance. The middle ages were not perfect: they had evils all their own; but they were very unlike what they appeared to the gloomy imagination of a French theophilanthropist. Of the new interest in the middle ages, the pioneer in this century was Sir Walter Scott; his indirect relation to the Oxford movement was often dwelt upon by Pusey in private conversation. That relation consisted not only in the high moral tone which characterized Scott's writings and which marked them off so sharply from the contemporary popular writers of fiction, but also and especially in the interest which he aroused on behalf of ages and persons who had been buried out of sight to an extent that to our generation would appear incredible.

Another influence, very unlike Scott's, yet distinctly contributory to the Tractarian movement, was that of S. T. Coleridge, the philosopher of Highgate. Coleridge was the author less of a philosophy than of a method: he spent his life in asking questions which were not answered, and in projecting schemes which were never carried out. But he was a great force in making men dissatisfied with the superficiality so common a hundred years ago in religion as in other matters; and in this, if in no other way, he prepared the English mind to listen to the Oxford teachers.

Viewed on another side, however, the Oxford movement was a completion of the earlier revival of religion known as Evangelical. That revival was provoked by the prevalence of a latitudinarian theology in the last century, and by a dry and cold preaching of morality, often only of natural morality, which left out of view, or, at least, failed to assign its rightful place to the Person and Work of our Divine Redeemer. This failure led to

the movement which outside the Church became Wesleyan, and within it Evangelicalism. In its earlier days the Evangelical movement was mainly if not exclusively interested in maintaining a certain body of positive truth. The great doctrines which alone make 'repentance towards God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ' seriously possible were its constant theme. The world to come, with its boundless issues of life and death, the infinite value of the one Atonement, the regenerating, purifying, guiding action of God the Holy Spirit in respect of the Christian soul, were preached to our grandfathers with a force and earnestness which are beyond controversy. The deepest and most fervid religion in England during the first three decades of this century was that of the Evangelicals; and, to the last day of his life, Pusey remained that 'love of the Evangelicals' to which he often alluded, and which was roused by their efforts to make religion a living power in a cold and gloomy age.

But the Evangelical movement, partly in virtue of its very intensity, was, in respect of its advocacy of religious truth, an imperfect and one-sided movement. It laid stress upon such doctrines of Divine Revelation as appeared to its promoters to be calculated to produce a converting or sanctifying effect upon the souls of men. Its interpretation of the New Testament,—little as its leaders ever suspected this,—was guided by a traditional assumption as arbitrary and as groundless as any tradition which it ever denounced. The real sources of its 'Gospel' were limited to a few chapters in St. Paul's Epistles, perhaps in two of them, understood in a manner which left much else in Holy Scripture out of account; and thus the Old Testament history, and even the Life of our Lord Jesus Christ, as recorded by the Evangelists, were thrown, comparatively, into the background. The needs and salvation of the individual, rather than the whole revealed Will of Him whom we believe, was the governing consideration. In consequence, those entire departments of the Christian religion which deal with the corporate union of Christians

with Christ in His Church and with the Sacraments, which by His appointment are the channels of His grace to the end of time, were not so much forgotten as unrecognized. The days had not yet come when Evangelicals would think it possible to promote their Redeemer's honour by depreciating His own Church and Sacraments; but the omission to teach the whole body of revealed truth exposed the Evangelical revival to obvious dangers. Truths which they neglected rested on authority just as cogent as that which warranted the truths which they taught; and when, in an age of critical inquiry, this was once perceived, the Evangelical position became untenable. If men combined to reject, with open eyes, the truths which the Evangelicals omitted to teach, they would go on to reject the truths on which the Evangelicals insisted. If, on the other hand, they made the most of the truths insisted on by the Evangelical teachers, they would learn to accept, as resting on the same authority, connected truths beyond. The perception of this necessity, at once intellectual and spiritual, was one great contributory influence which—as especially in the case of Newman and the Wilberforces—produced the Oxford movement.

Side by side with Evangelicalism there were also convictions which had been handed down across the dreary interval of the eighteenth century, and which here and there found expression in the lives of holy men, who taught a generation of Latitudinarians and Methodists how the great men of the Caroline age in the Church of England had believed and lived and died. Such men as Jones of Nayland, and Dr. Sikes of Guilsborough, and, at a somewhat later period, Mr. Norris of Hackney, and Mr. Joshua Watson, were of this company. The first two were theologians, inheriting and contemplating truths on which the Non-jurors had laid stress, and living in communion of thought and sympathy with the ancient Church. The 'Society for the Reformation of Principles' and the 'Scholar Armed,' which marked the last decade of the eighteenth century, bore witness to the traditional belief

in the revealed doctrine of the Church and the Sacraments which had never died out in the Church of England.

Dr. T. Sikes was especially regarded by Pusey as a precursor of the Oxford movement. He had graduated at Pembroke College, Oxford, in 1788; but his earlier University life had been passed at St. Edmund Hall, which was already at that date a home of Evangelicalism. Its earnest but defective teaching made a deep though not a wholly satisfying impression on the thoughtful undergraduate; and when he turned from the lectures which he heard in the Hall to the weight and learning of a really great divine like Thorndike, his religious future was determined¹. He lived a life of retirement in his little country parish in Northamptonshire; but men, young and old, came to him for the sake of his thoughtful and stimulating conversation, to which vigour of intellect, extensive reading, a disciplined sense of humour, and a piety of an ancient rather than a modern type, contributed the chief features². One of his conversations, which took place so late as in 1833, and was at the time reported to Pusey, was often referred to by him as having a sort of prophetic value. Dr. Sikes died in December, 1834; and the conversation in question was quoted eight years afterwards by Pusey, in his letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury, deprecating the inequitable estimate of the Oxford Movement which was then already prevalent. Pusey's informant told him:—

‘I well remember the very countenance, gesture, attitude, and tone of good Mr. Sikes, and give you, as near as may be, what he said.

“I seem to think I can tell you something which you who are young may probably live to see, but which I, who shall soon be called away off the stage, shall not. Wherever I go all about the country I see amongst the clergy a number of very amiable and estimable men, many of them much in earnest, and wishing to do good. But I have observed one universal want in their teaching: the uniform suppression

¹ Dr. Sikes certainly disliked what he considered conventionalisms and assumptions in Puritanism: though Mr. Gladstone scarcely does justice to his point of view; ‘Gleanings of Past

Years,’ vii. pp. 216–218.

² See a record of some of these conversations, extracted from Mr. Norris's diary, in Churton's ‘Memoir of Joshua Watson,’ p. 30 (2nd ed.).

of one great truth. There is no account given anywhere, so far as I see, of the one Holy Catholic Church. I think that the causes of this suppression have been mainly two. The Church has been kept out of sight, partly in consequence of the civil establishment of the branch of it which is in this country, and partly out of false charity to Dissent. Now this great truth is an article of the Creed; and if so, to teach the rest of the Creed to its exclusion must be to destroy 'the analogy or proportion of the faith,' *τὴν ἀναλογίαν τῆς πίστεως*. This cannot be done without the most serious consequences. The doctrine is of the last importance, and the principles it involves of immense power; and some day, not far distant, it will judicially have its reprisals. And whereas the other articles of the Creed seem now to have thrown it into the shade, it will seem, when it is brought forward, to swallow up the rest. We now hear not a breath about the Church; by and bye those who live to see it will hear of nothing else; and, just in proportion perhaps to its present suppression, will be its future development. Our confusion nowadays is chiefly owing to the want of it; and there will be yet more confusion attending its revival. The effects of it I even dread to contemplate, especially if it come suddenly. And woe betide those, whoever they are, who shall, in the course of Providence, have to bring it forward. It ought especially of all others to be matter of catechetical teaching and training. The doctrine of the Church Catholic and the privileges of Church membership cannot be explained from pulpits; and those who will have to explain it will hardly know where they are, or which way they are to turn themselves. They will be endlessly misunderstood and misinterpreted. There will be one great outcry of Popery from one end of the country to the other. It will be thrust upon minds unprepared, and on an uncatechized Church. Some will take it up and admire it as a beautiful picture, others will be frightened and run away and reject it; and all will want a guidance which one hardly knows where they shall find. How the doctrine may be first thrown forward we know not; but the powers of the world may any day turn their backs upon us, and this will probably lead to those effects I have described¹."

Of the Hackney School, to which Pusey used often to refer, the chief figure was the Rev. H. H. Norris, Rector of Hackney. Norris was a younger friend of Dr. Sikes of Guilsborough. He took holy orders against his father's wishes, but in a spirit of resolute devotion to the Christian cause, imperilled, as it seemed, by the triumphs of revolution and unbelief at the close of the last century. With him was associated his life-long

¹ 'Letter to His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury,' by E. B. Pusey, D.D., 1842; pp. 27-29.

friend Mr. Joshua Watson, born, like himself, in 1771. Mr. Watson belonged to that type of layman, pious, practical, energetic, resolutely loyal to the great truths of religion, of which Robert Nelson, Thomas Stevens, John Bowdler were examples, and which the Church of England, perhaps more than any other portion of the Church of Christ, has constantly produced. Mr. Norris and Mr. Watson were deeply impressed with the necessity for making unusual efforts to maintain and propagate Christian faith and life in their day and generation. They were neither of them deficient in theological interests or accomplishments; but it may perhaps be thought that, in consequence of his intimacy with men like Bishop Lloyd and Van Mildert, Mr. Watson was at times credited by others with a ripe theological judgment which he did not in fact possess, and which he would have disclaimed for himself. The real and lasting title of Mr. Norris and Mr. Joshua Watson to our respect lies in their eager advocacy of all efforts for the promotion of Christianity. With Mr. Bowles, they were joint founders of the National Society for the Education of the Poor. For many years they were intimately associated in raising the tone and widening the usefulness of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. They gave a new impulse to the work of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel; and indeed it would be difficult to name any good work of a public character in connexion with the Church of England in which Mr. Joshua Watson had no share. They both spent their lives in recognition of the truth that the Church of Christ is worth the best thought and toil that a Christian, be he layman or priest, can give it; and this conviction, implanted in many minds by their words and their example, made ready the way for the labours of the Tractarians. As Pusey said shortly before his own death, these men 'must have prepared the ground for the Tracts. The Tracts found an echo everywhere. Friends started up like armed men from the ground. I only dreaded our being too popular. It was like the men from the heath in "The Lady of the Lake."'

But Pusey was accustomed to speak of Mr. Joshua Watson as a witness to the sounder faith of an earlier generation. Writing to Newman from Brighton, on Sept. 11, 1839, he says :—

‘I had a very pleasant interview with J. Watson on Saturday; he is staying here: I introduced the subject of Mr. Benson’s discourses as a feeler; and I was delighted to find him taking altogether the same views as ourselves, so far. It was quite refreshing to hear an old man speaking the same things, clearly and calmly; it seemed to link us on so visibly with past generations, and that we were teaching no other than had been delivered to us. He asked after you; and naming “Kemble,” said, “I do not like prefixing the title ‘Mr.’ to his or Newman’s or your name¹.”’

Mr. Watson’s position was acknowledged by the unsanctioned dedication in 1840 of the fifth volume of Newman’s *Parochial Sermons* to him, as ‘the benefactor of all his brethren, by his long and dutiful ministry, and patient service, to his and their common Mother.’ But he did not continue to sympathize with the Movement in the troubled times that followed.

Another layman of that generation has been referred to as a precursor of the Oxford movement, although in a different sense from that of Mr. Joshua Watson. Mr. Alexander Knox was a man of great ability whose earlier interest in politics had been overpowered by a stronger interest in religion. As a boy he was intimate with and admired by Wesley. As a man, he was a great reader, a great talker, and a great letter-writer. In his earlier life, schemes for reforming the Prayer-book in the interests of comprehension were rife, and were even sanctioned by men who rose to be Bishops: Percy of Dromore, Yorke of Ely, Porteus of London. Mr. Knox’s governing enthusiasm,—and it was a very reasoned enthusiasm,—was for the Prayer-book as it is. To him the Prayer-book was virtually the transcript of what the Church has said in its converse with God from the earliest period: it was verbatim what she has been repeating without alteration from the sixth century;

¹ E. B. P. to J. H. N., Sept. 11, 1839. There are also several other references to Mr. Watson in Pusey’s letters to Newman.

it was a standard of doctrine as well as of devotion ; it contained everything essential to Catholic theology ; it was the golden chain which binds us to the great mystical Body of Christ ; the pledge of our continuity as a Church ; the stimulus and nursery of missionary enterprise ; the one safeguard against the vacillations of sectarianism. Recognizing as he did the services of the Evangelicals in the field of experimental religion, he held that they taught a type of piety which, without their intending it, promoted Dissent ; they ‘diffused doctrines which cannot cordially coalesce with our different services’ ; they had, in the language of the Epistle to the Hebrews, fed on milk only, and systematically rejected strong meats. A point of great value, on which he constantly insists in his correspondence, is the moral character of justifying faith : the notion of a purely forensic justification had not been taught by any writer previous to the Reformation. His language about the Eucharist, if here and there slightly inaccurate, is as a whole very remarkable, considering the age in which he lived. The Eucharist, he says, ‘is the connecting link between earth and heaven : the point where our Redeemer is vitally accessible, “the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever.”’ The Greek Church of the early ages commanded his warmest sympathies : it was ‘the noblest portion of ancient Christianity’ : it was from the earliest times the trustee of the doctrine of holiness : its work was nearly done when it had produced St. Chrysostom. Not that his estimates of the Fathers were always accurate, or, indeed, deferential and modest. He did not look upon antiquity as having an authority distinct in kind from that of any section of modern and divided Christendom ; he criticizes St. Augustine as though he were equally in error with Calvin.

‘Surely,’ wrote Mr. Keble, ‘it is rather an arrogant position in which Mr. Knox delighted to imagine himself, as one on the top of a high hill, seeing which way different schools tend (the school of Primitive Antiquity being but one among many) and passing judgement upon each, how far it is right, and how well it suited its time—himself superior to all, exercising a royal right of eclecticism over all!’

¹ Coleridge’s ‘Memoir of Keble,’ p. 242.

This estimate of Mr. Knox's writings will partly explain the slight use which was made of them by the Oxford School. The Tractarians felt that they could not claim him as a whole; and they certainly were not indebted to him for anything that they knew of Catholic antiquity or Catholic truth¹. But they did occasionally use him as being a witness, in dark times, to portions of the truth which they were reasserting; and in this sense he may be described as a precursor of the Oxford revival. He died, two years before its birth, on Jan. 17, 1831.

Another pioneer of the Movement, of a different kind, was the Rev. John Miller: his relation to it is chiefly observable in the influence which he exerted over Mr. Keble. They were nearly contemporaries, and in point of habit and character had much in common with each other. Miller was a divine of the school of Bishop Butler, and to the end of his life Mr. Keble constantly recommended his Bampton Lectures² to younger friends.

'What a book his is!' he writes: 'the more I go on pondering it, the more light it seems to throw on every subject; and hardly anything else that I take up does not put me in mind of it'³.

One of Miller's contributions to Tractarianism was that high estimate of the value of moral arguments which was one of its leading characteristics. Mr. Keble was fond of quoting a saying of Miller's to the effect that the time had now come in which 'scoundrels must be called scoundrels'⁴. But, intimate as he was with Keble, he stood somewhat aloof from the Movement in his later years, if indeed he ever threw himself heartily into it. He died, after a short illness, in 1858.

The more immediate preparation, however, was the work of four men, differing widely in character and capacity, but

¹ This I have heard Dr. Pusey say. Of Knox's 'Remains,' the first two vols. were published in 1834 (2nd ed. 1836); the third and fourth in 1837.

² 'The Divine Authority of Holy Scripture asserted from its adaptation to the real state of Human Nature,'

1817, by John Miller, M.A., Fellow of Worcester College, Oxford. Baxter, 1819 (2nd ed.).

³ Coleridge's 'Memoir of Rev. J. Keble,' p. 24.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 241.

united by a strong desire to do what they might in perilous times for the cause of the Church and Religion.

Of these the best known was Hugh James Rose, Pusey's old antagonist: his wide reading, great practical ability, entire disinterestedness, and fervent zeal have already been mentioned. Rose was indefatigable in insisting, both through the press and in conversation, on the necessity of combined action of some kind to resist the dangers which threatened the Church. In 1832 he undertook, from a sheer sense of duty, the editorship of the *British Magazine*.

'A few months ago only,' he wrote to Perceval, 'I could not have believed that I should ever have anything to do with what I hate so cordially as I do periodical literature. . . . But still ours are no common circumstances; and whatever can be done without sacrifice of principles must be done, if it promises to be of service. A journal where men who do not agree in minor points, but do agree in love for the Church, in thinking that an Establishment, a Ritual, a Confession of Faith, Episcopacy, and so on, are precious things to us and those who will come after us, seemed to me likely to be of such service. It would excite what is wanting, namely, a spirit of resistance to wrong; it would give what is wanting, namely, information; and it would supply a point of union.'

The *British Magazine*, besides discharging the duties incident to a magazine, anticipated in not a few respects the 'Tracts for the Times.' Besides articles and reviews of books, it contained tracts on particular subjects of theological interest, translations from the Fathers, and even from the Breviary, and poems which were the first expression of the earnest faith and keen feelings of the Oxford party, and which were afterwards collected in the volume known as the 'Lyra Apostolica.' Nowhere else may the state of mind which preceded and fostered the revival be studied more accurately than in the *British Magazine*: indeed, much in it was at first written by more than one of the authors of the 'Tracts for the Times,' although, as a Cambridge man, its editor could not in turn contribute to a publication which, like the Tracts, professed to be written 'by members of the University of Oxford.'

With Mr. Rose was associated the Rev. William (after-

wards Sir William) Palmer, of Worcester College, Oxford. He had been educated at Trinity College, Dublin, and had come to Oxford in 1828 in order to read in the libraries, with a view to completing his work on the Antiquities of the English Ritual. This work, enriched by notes of Bishop Lloyd, was published at the Oxford University Press in 1832, under the title of '*Origines Liturgicae*'.¹ Insisting as it did upon the almost forgotten fact that the Prayer-book is mainly a translation from earlier office-books, and so represents the descent of the Reformed Church of England from the Church of earlier days, this book powerfully contributed to increase that devotion to the traditions of the Church which characterized the Tracts. Moreover, the author was a man of marked ability, with the intellectual habits of a theologian, and at the same time a man of practical interests and warm religious feeling. Mr. Palmer's book, wrote Keble to Perceval, 'is first-rate. And when you meet him he is the mildest and most unpretending of men; just the man to write on the Prayer-book.'

Another whose practical experience led him to welcome the Oxford Tracts was Walter Farquhar Hook, who had now been for ten years engaged in parochial work with an energy and success which has left its mark on the Church of England. And the social centre of the group was the Hon. and Rev. A. P. Perceval, Vicar of East Horsley, Surrey. His character was such as to inspire warm affection; and ever since 1821 he had corresponded intimately with Keble on all kinds of religious and political subjects. He was now engaged on a Catechism on Church Doctrine, which commanded general approval among his Church friends. Palmer could find nothing in it that needed alteration. Hook was delighted, but suggested at least one substantial improvement. Newman, writing on behalf of the Association of Friends of the Church, asked for two hundred copies of it, with a view to general circulation 'as a specimen of what we mean to do.'

¹ Palmer's '*Narrative*,' pp. 24, 25 (ed. 1883).

It was indeed high time that the friends of the Church should be taking some vigorous defensive action; there were abundant reasons for the very gravest anxiety. Lord Henley's crude proposals for dealing with the cathedrals were the language of wisdom and friendship when compared with other projects that were in the air. Outside the Church of England there were, first, the unbelievers of the school of Tom Paine, who were for sweeping away the Christian religion altogether. Next, there were the political Dissenters, whose hostility to the Church of England rendered them practically insensible to all considerations save that of how to do the Church such mischief as they could. But the state of thought within the Church was the cause of even more serious alarm. Not only was it said that some Bishops were favourable to changes in the Prayer-book, but also widely-circulated pamphlets recommended the abolition of the Creeds, at least in public worship; and, of course, they especially attacked the Creed of Athanasius. The doctrines of Baptismal Regeneration and of Absolution, even the Name of the Most Holy Trinity, were vehemently assailed.

And these revolutionary proposals as regards the faith were finding practical support from the followers of Arnold and Maltby, who were anxious to retain the outer shell of the Church as a national establishment, but to destroy its office as a witness for those parts of Divine Revelation which were not accepted by Protestant bodies outside it. In his pamphlet on 'The Principles of Church Reform' Dr. Arnold proposed to identify Church and State by the simple expedient of including all denominations within the lines of the Church.

'Such,' says Sir William Palmer, 'was the disorganization of the public mind, that Dr. Arnold of Rugby ventured to propose that all sects should be united by Act of Parliament with the Church of England, on the principle of retaining all their distinctive errors and absurdities.'

Before the Reform Bill of 1832 became law, the feeling amongst earnest Churchmen was uneasiness; afterwards,

it was chronic alarm. With the new Parliament, it seemed, anything was possible. Keble writes in October, 1832 :—

‘I have been considering as well as I could what line it becomes the clergy to take with a view to the possible proceedings of the first revolutionary Parliament when it assembles, and I have made up my mind that we can hardly be too passive until something really illegal, and contrary to our oaths and engagements, is pressed on us : such as I conceive it would be, were we to admit alterations in the Liturgy, or Articles, on less authority than that by which they were sanctioned ; or to be aiding in any compromise which should transfer corporate property to other people, on any pretence of equalization or the like. The only measure of the latter kind which I can think of with any sort of toleration would be the annexation of the great tithes, by the several Chapters and Colleges, to the livings from which they arise, wherever such annexation is desirable : and this I own appears to me not only expedient but a matter of absolute religious duty. . . . What I say is, let us be attacked from without, if it be God’s will, sooner than begin alterations within, with a set of presumptuous workers who cannot agree. . . . Everything looks like a sweeping storm at hand.’

The cry of the day was for universal reform, but for reform proceeding on no clearly defined principles ; any change, in whatever direction, was welcomed as better than leaving things as they were.

‘Things go on at such a rate,’ Keble writes again, ‘that one is quite giddy. . . . Anything, humanly speaking, will be better than for the Church to go on in union with such a State ; and I think, as far as I can judge, that this is becoming, every day, a more general feeling among Churchmen.’

But the more immediate incitement to action was the introduction into Parliament in February, 1833, of Lord Stanley’s Irish Church Temporalities Bill, suppressing one-half of the Irish Episcopate. This measure appeared to justify the gloomiest anticipations respecting the conduct of the Reformed Parliament when dealing with the interests of religion. To some minds, indeed, it presented itself as only the natural consequence of the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts in 1828, of the passing of the Roman Catholic Emancipation Act in 1829, and of the great Reform Bill of 1831. For others, who recognized in those previous measures a political and social justice which could not be

really hostile to the safety of the Church of Christ, this last proposal of Lord Stanley seemed a new departure in an irreligious direction. All men who had the spiritual interests of the Church primarily at heart were substantially agreed in deploring it; they could not but see in it the presage of worse measures that might follow. To suppress, at a blow, ten Dioceses, which had existed for more than as many centuries, was to exhibit with cynical frankness the estimate in which the modern State held the sanctions as well as the possessions of the Christian Church; and the spectacle roused in her sons a deep feeling into which anger, and grief, and a desire to do something that might vindicate her outraged rights, were combined as important ingredients.

This feeling was expressed when Newman complained to Whately that 'half the candlesticks of the Irish Church were extinguished, without ecclesiastical sanction¹;' and when Keble wrote, that unless Churchmen described the 'profane intrusion' of the State as it deserved, our children's children would say, 'There was once here a glorious Church; but it was betrayed into the hands of libertines, for the real or affected love of a little temporary peace and good order².'

On the 30th of July, 1833, the third reading of the Bill was carried in the House of Lords by a majority of 135 votes to 81.

The first step in the way of associated resistance to the evils dreaded by Churchmen was taken by Mr. Rose. He invited a party of friends, more or less like-minded, to spend some days with him at Hadleigh, just after Midsummer, 1833. Palmer, Perceval, Copeland, Lebas, Hurrell Froude, Keble, and Newman were invited. Of these Keble and Newman were not present: it afterwards appeared, said Palmer, that they 'had no confidence in meetings or committees.' The conference continued for nearly a week. It was concluded without arriving at any definite

¹ 'Life of Archbishop Whately,' p. 114 (ed. 1875).

² Sermon on National Apostasy,

Pref. to First Edition. 'Sermons Academical and Occasional,' p. 128.

resolutions. But it had the effect of deepening a sense of the necessity of combined action, and especially of issuing publications which might deepen attachment to the Church.

Closely following upon the Hadleigh Conference, but distinct from it, were the meetings at Oriel College, Oxford, which led to the formation of 'The Association of Friends of the Church.' At Oriel, Newman and Keble came upon the scene: Hurrell Froude, as well as Palmer, was a connecting link between Hadleigh and Oriel. At Oriel a distinct effort was made to agree upon a basis of co-operation and resistance; and with this view two papers were drawn up, chiefly by Keble, which were afterwards superseded by a third, the work of the Rev. W. Palmer. In this last document the objects of the Association were said to be twofold. It was 'to maintain pure and inviolate the doctrines, the services, and the discipline of the Church,' and thus it was to

'withstand all change involving the denial or suppression of doctrine, a departure from primitive practice in religious offices, or innovation upon the Apostolical prerogatives, order, and commission of bishops, priests, and deacons;'

and it was to afford Churchmen an opportunity of exchanging sentiments, and of co-operating on a large scale.

Of these meetings in Oxford one result was a series of similar meetings throughout the country. Mr. Palmer went as a 'deputation' to London, Winchester, and Coventry, with a view to rousing clerical feeling; his efforts were attended with considerable success. Another result was an address to the Archbishop of Canterbury, assuring him of the adherence of the signatories to the doctrine, polity, and Prayer-book of the Church. In the event this address was signed by nearly 7,000 clergy, and was presented in February 1834 to the Archbishop by an influential deputation. It was followed by a second address from the laity, which received 230,000 signatures, and which also was presented to the Archbishop in the following May.

In this work, of promoting general organization and addresses which might rouse and give force to Church opinion, Mr. Palmer took a leading part. He made it possible to place before the country and the Government so imposing a declaration of adherence to the existing system, teaching, and polity of the Church, as to prevent any seriously revolutionary proposals. This was, in the circumstances, a great gain: it procured a respite during which other and more lasting work might be done. The vivid apprehension and exposition of the only principles by which the Church of Christ is really defensible as an institution among men was the work of other and deeper minds than Palmer's. Keble and Newman were at this time in intimate and hearty co-operation with him. But it lay in the nature of things that his idea of what was required by the emergency could not, in the long run, entirely coincide with theirs. In the earliest days of the Association, before any public action was taken, serious discussion arose as to the means by which 'the friends of the Church' should approach their fellow Churchmen. Palmer, Rose, and others desired calculated and combined action. Newman, on the other hand, with the heartiest support of Keble and Froude, claimed personal liberty. He had little faith in the laboured appeals of Committees out of which all the sting had been extracted. His plan was to arouse by Tracts; short, full of nerve, intentionally alarming in tone, 'as a man might give notice of a fire or inundation,' transparently clear in statement, and setting forth the truths on which the Church rested with uncompromising simplicity. This method was rejected: the Association would not own Newman's earliest tracts, and Newman and his friends would not give them up. Thus the small band of Oxford 'Tractarians' diverged from the main body of those with whom they sympathized, to pursue a path of their own by which, with whatever losses, their common object certainly was attained. 'Naked statements,' as Newman afterwards said of the early tracts, 'which offend the accurate and cautious, are

necessary upon occasions to infuse seriousness into the indifferent¹.'

The real originators of this Oxford movement were undoubtedly Keble and Newman: Pusey was not at present publicly associated with them. It is however difficult to say in what exact sense or proportion the leadership should be assigned to each of these two men. Undoubtedly to the world at large Newman, at any rate at first, was the principal figure in the Revival. But it may be questioned whether he did not himself derive from Keble his first impulse as well as many of his underlying principles. Newman himself speaks of Keble as 'the true and primary author of the movement.' 'I compared myself with Keble,' he says, 'and felt that I was merely developing his, not my, convictions².' Keble was invested from his Oxford days with the prestige of a very distinguished University career. He was a great scholar in days when scholarship was really appreciated. His age made him the natural guide and adviser of his colleagues. And in him the authority of years was reinforced and illuminated by an intellect, strong, patient, penetrating, equitable, and still more by a character of exquisite delicacy and sensitiveness which exerted an irresistible fascination over all who came near it, and who had any appreciation of moral beauty. Cardinal Newman has expressed himself in the 'Apologia' as follows:—

'As far as I know, he who turned the tide, and brought the talent of the University round to the side of the old theology, and against what was familiarly called "march-of-mind," was Mr. Keble. In and from Keble the mental activity of Oxford took that contrary direction which issued in what was called Tractarianism³.'

Pusey also always held that the real source of the Oxford Movement was to be found in 'The Christian Year,' which had been published in 1827. And this was not only Pusey's opinion. When in 1844 Newman was living at Littlemore, an incident occurred to which Pusey often referred in conversation.

¹ Advertisement to 'Tracts for the Times,' vol. iii. p. vii.

² 'Apologia pro vitâ suâ,' p. 75; Newman's 'Letters,' &c., i. 416.

³ 'Apologia,' p. 289 (ed. 1880).

'I was in the waiting-room,' said Pusey, 'at Littlemore with Newman, and some one came in and said that a certain book had been burnt, not publicly, but as the "*fons et origo mali*." What was it? While I was pondering, Newman at once answered, "The Christian Year, I suppose."'

The instinct at any rate of the opponents of Tractarianism to distrust the widespread influence of the 'Christian Year' was true; for independently of its spiritual elevation, it prepared the way for the Movement by the emphasis which it laid upon the Sacramental principle, and upon the deeper meaning of Holy Scripture. Still, more than this was needed. It was essential that men's minds should be roused to a sense of the Church's danger and of their own duty, if any effort was to be made serious and systematic enough to influence the convictions of the great mass of Church people, and to modify the course of events. And this too was mainly the work of Mr. Keble, through his memorable sermon on National Apostasy, preached in Oxford on July 14, 1833. 'I have,' says Cardinal Newman, 'ever considered and kept the day as the start of the religious movement of 1833.'

The fact is that Keble, unlike Newman, had been a High Churchman all his life. His powerfully constructive mind grasped from the beginning the strength of the Anglican position as opposed to Protestantism and Rationalism, as well as to the yet unappreciated power of Romanism. He saw, as he stated in one of the earliest tracts, that the Apostolical Succession was the essential bond, recognized by sixteenth and seventeenth century divines, associating the English Church through Reformation and Papal dominion with that Primitive Catholicism in which Anglicans laid their foundations and to which they had always appealed. He was never conscious of being an innovator. And with this firmness of conviction and principle he was able, in spite of his retiring disposition, not only to strike heavy blows in controversy, but on occasion to head protests and even agitations.

In the first moments, however, of the Revival, some gifts differing from these were required to stir the minds of

Churchmen in general, and to lift them to a higher plane of thought and action. The needed qualities were contributed by Newman. With an unrivalled command of logic and pathos, he combined a singularly subtle beauty of style; and this combination caused his writings to bring home to his contemporaries the realities of spiritual things never before appreciated. The Parochial Sermons at St. Mary's struck a note which seemed new when it sounded first, and which, even yet, has not ceased to vibrate. And the majority of the Tracts, the earliest, and the most important, were the work of Newman. It was his power of speech and writing, combined with his enthusiasm, practical energy, and attractive personality, which could alone supply the necessary impetus at the start.

Pusey, as has been said, came into the Movement, not at the outset, but when it had been already created and shaped by others. He had indeed been dealing with some of the evils which called it into existence, in his own way and according to his opportunities. Even in his book on German Theology he had opposed Mr. Rose, not for his defence of orthodoxy, but as being a champion who might, as he thought, damage their common cause by mistaking at least some friends for foes. In his work on Cathedral Institutions he had endeavoured to arrest the assaults on the outer fabric of the Church by proposing an improved use of an important part of her endowments. In private he had been labouring for the same ends; but when the Tractarian movement began he did not join it. He was not invited to Hadleigh, nor to the meetings at Oriel.

'As yet,' says Palmer, 'we knew nothing of Pusey: he was supposed to be favourable to the Innovating party: did not join the Association; and only became connected with the cause when Newman had taken the place of leader, and the movement had become Tractarian¹.'

He undoubtedly felt the gravity of the crisis; it was

¹ Palmer's 'Narrative,' p. 50 (ed. 1883). In this representation there appear to be two mistakes. Although not a member of the Association of Friends of the Church, Pusey exerted himself to circulate its address. And

the movement had become Tractarian by the publication of some twenty-five of the 'Tracts for the Times' before the two addresses of the Association were presented to the Primate in the spring of 1834.

early in 1833 that he wrote to Mr. Gladstone, who had just left Christ Church and entered Parliament, with reference to the debate on the Irish Church Temporalities Bill, 'The appearances of things are very formidable, if a Christian might fear.' It is, however, characteristic of his mind at this moment, that his objection to the manner in which it was proposed to deal with the Church was that 'the Irish sees might at all events render much aid to Episcopal government¹.' Still, though he had not joined the Movement he very soon began to circulate the Tracts, the first of which was published on September 9, 1833; in November he signed the address to the Archbishop; on December 21st, Tract No. 18 was issued with his initials.

Cardinal Newman thus describes the importance of Pusey's adhesion to the Movement:—

'I had known him well, . . . and felt for him an enthusiastic admiration. I used to call him "*ὁ μέγας*."

'His great learning, his immense diligence, his scholarlike mind, his simple devotion to the cause of religion, overcame me; and great of course was my joy, when in the last days of 1833 he showed a disposition to make common cause with us. . . .

'He at once gave to us a position and a name. Without him we should have had little chance, especially at the early date of 1834, of making any serious resistance to the Liberal aggression. But Dr. Pusey was a Professor and Canon of Christ Church; he had a vast influence in consequence of his deep religious seriousness, the munificence of his charities, his Professorship, his family connexions, and his easy relations with University authorities. He was to the movement all that Mr. Rose might have been, with that indispensable addition, which was wanting to Mr. Rose, the intimate friendship and the familiar daily society of the persons who had commenced it. And he had that special claim on their attachment which lies in the living presence of a faithful and loyal affectionateness. . . .

'Dr. Pusey was, to use the common expression, a host in himself; he was able to give a name, a form, and a personality, to what was without him a sort of mob; and when various parties had to meet together in order to resist the liberal acts of the Government, we of the movement took our place by right among them. . . .

'He was a man of large designs; he had a hopeful, sanguine mind; he had no fear of others; he was haunted by no intellectual perplexities².'

¹ E. B. P. to W. E. Gladstone, Esq., Feb. 15, 1833.

² *Apologia* (ed. 1880), pp. 61, 62.

In the sequel it appeared that Pusey was something more than is conveyed even by these words of his generous and affectionate friend. When that friend was no longer able to retain the great place to which his character and his genius alike pointed, it was the special gifts of Pusey, and his unfaltering confidence in the Divine mission of the English Church, supported of course throughout by the sympathy and strength of Keble, which, at a supremely critical moment, saved their common work from utter dissolution.

CHAPTER XII.

THE EARLY TRACTS—PUSEY'S FIRST TRACT, ON FASTING
—ARNOLD'S CRITICISMS — ILLNESS — CONTROVERSY
ABOUT SUBSCRIPTION—THE DUKE OF WELLINGTON
CHANCELLOR—PROPOSED HEBREW NEW TESTAMENT.

1833-1834.

DURING the early part of the eventful Long Vacation of 1833, Pusey was chiefly at Christ Church, and mainly occupied with the Catalogue of Arabic Manuscripts. He spent a great deal of time in selecting and superintending the beautiful specimens of Arabic lithography which form the first nine pages of the great work. The printers at the Clarendon Press made unusual demands on him when correcting the proofs, and he found the work at times very wearying. 'As week after week disappears,' he wrote, 'the sheets of the Catalogue advance; and so, I suppose, I am nearer the end. Yet I do so little that I marvel how in Term time I do anything.' Twelve days later he hopes that the Catalogue 'will have made good progress before we meet.' 'Would,' he adds, 'I could hope that it will be altogether printed by Christmas; but land seems nearer.'

He spent the latter part of the vacation, from August 3rd to October 16th, at Holton Park, near Wheatley, with his wife and children, on a visit to his mother, Lady Lucy Pusey, who had taken the place on a lease. The old moated manor-house had been the headquarters of Fairfax during the siege of Oxford in 1646, and the scene of the marriage of Bridget, daughter of Oliver Cromwell, to Fairfax's Commissary-General, Henry Ireton, on the 15th of June in that year. But this historic house had been pulled down and replaced by the more modern edifice

which still exists. Pusey was very fond of the place : he preached frequently in the little parish church ; and in particular on September 29th in this year, on the Ministry of Angels. But he did not relax his literary work. Every morning in the week he rode into Oxford, reaching the Bodleian Library at nine o'clock, and working there until it closed, when he rode out again to Holton. Late in life he would often refer to these early morning rides, in which the fresh air of 'Shotover made it so easy to praise Almighty God,' as one of the happy memories of his earlier years.

The laborious monotony—not that he thought it such—of his life was interrupted by one or more short visits to friends. Towards the end of the vacation, while on a visit at Longford Castle, Pusey preached, on behalf of the Salisbury Infirmary, a sermon of which one of the best laymen in Salisbury, Mr. Hussey, used to say, that he 'never heard anything like it : all later sermons on the subject seemed by comparison shallow and pointless.' The point mainly insisted on is the value of self-denial, not only with a view to works of mercy, but as an instrument of moral and spiritual improvement : it is the first expression of the line of thought which is the main feature of Pusey's first contribution to the 'Tracts for the Times.'

Pusey had been in Oxford when incidents occurred which have already become historical, but of the full importance of which neither those who took part in them, nor those who witnessed them, were as yet conscious. Newman returned from his Mediterranean tour on July 9th. On the following Sunday, July 14th, Keble preached that Assize sermon on National Apostasy which Newman held to be 'the start of the religious movement of 1833.' It is possible that Pusey heard this sermon ; but no record of his sense of the importance of this manifesto survives. The copy of the published sermon which was sent him 'from the author' is still uncut. Though he was not as yet definitely and consciously associated with Newman and Keble in any distinct theological enterprise, still Pusey seems

to have been in some degree connected with the Movement from the first, so far as it was a movement in Oxford. If Mr. Rose did not invite him to the Hadleigh meeting, this omission may be accounted for by their earlier relation to each other. But as soon as the 'Tracts for the Times' appeared, Pusey, as has been said, interested himself in their circulation.

Of this remarkable series of publications the beginnings were sufficiently humble. 'A tract,' wrote Newman to Perceval, 'would be long enough if it filled four octavo pages.' Again, 'We hope to publish tracts for hawkers' baskets in time. Are you disposed to draw up a series of translations from Eusebius' Ecclesiastical History? Or what do you think of such a measure? I mean for instance the account of St. John and the robber, whom he had had baptized in youth, the martyrs of Lyons, the account of the persecution at Alexandria given by Dionysius, &c. These are *popular* in their nature, and to the *people* we must come.'

The first Tracts are dated at the beginning of September. They were generally short, several keeping well within the suggested limit of four pages; and they were chiefly concerned with the constitution, ordinances, and services of the Church. Their first object was to restore and strengthen faith in those portions of the Divine Will which relate to the nature and organization of the Body of Christ, and which had been denied or forgotten by the popular religionism of the day. Of the first seventeen Tracts, nine were in part or altogether written by Newman, and they all deal with subjects belonging to this great truth¹. Of the remaining eight, John Keble had contributed two²—one on the Apostolic Succession, and one on the Sunday Lessons; his brother, Thomas Keble³, Hurrell Froude⁴, J. W. Bowden⁵ and Alfred Menzies⁶, both of Trinity College, and B. Harrison, Student of Christ Church⁷, furnished the remainder. The last three writers were still

¹ Tracts 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 15. The last was partly written by Mr. (afterwards Sir W.) Palmer.

² Tracts 4 and 13.

³ Tract 12.

⁴ Tract 9.

⁵ Tract 5.

⁶ Tract 14.

⁷ Tracts 16 and 17.

very young men. Three of the Tracts are explanations of, or comments upon, Church Lessons or Church Services¹; but these topics are chiefly discussed in view either of threatened alterations in or existing neglect of the Church's system and order. Newman's own account of this first set of Tracts is given in the following extract from a letter to Perceval, written on July 20, 1834 :—

‘As to the first tracts, every one has his own taste. You object to some things, another to others—if we altered to please every one the effect would be spoiled. They were not intended as symbols *ex cathedrâ*,—but as the expressions of *individual* minds;—and individuals, feeling strong, while on the one hand they are incidentally faulty in mode or language, are still peculiarly *effective*. No great work was done by a system—whereas systems rise out of individual exertions. Luther was an individual. The very faults of an individual excite attention—he loses, but his cause (if good, and he powerful-minded) gains—this is the way of things, we promote truth by a self-sacrifice. There are many things in Keble's tract on ‘Adherence to the Apostolical Succession’ which I could have wished said otherwise for one reason or other—but the whole was to my mind admirable, most persuasive and striking. So that a man corrects carefully upon his own standard, we must allow him his own standard. A critic must not attempt to mend a poem, or a connoisseur a painting. This is my apology for some of my tracts—as for others I plead the Spectator's “If I am at any time particularly dull, consider I have a reason for it.” The pruning-hook would perhaps have removed some tracts altogether—but they are parts of a whole.’

With the general drift of the earlier Tracts, Pusey was in full sympathy. Thus he writes to his brother William on an early criticism of the Tracts which appeared in the *Christian Observer*:—

‘It has wholly mistaken the object of the so-called Oxford Tracts, which are directed wholly to things spiritual, and concern themselves not at all with anything which can be called the temporals of the Church. . . . I expect that there will be much resistance, and much obloquy, because the views of this age are eminently compromising, rationalist, and low; self-extolling and impatient of authority. People, in consequence, cannot even understand right views of the Sacraments or the commission of the clergy.’

At first, indeed, he had formed a less favourable judgment. Referring to the early Tracts, he said in later life that

¹ Tracts 13, 14, and 16.

'those on the Apostolic Succession produced a great effect. I thought the subject dry, and not likely to interest people, but it was not so. The claim had been so entirely forgotten as to be practically new. One person, a dissenter in the Isle of Wight, said that she must go to church to see these successors of the Apostles. She went and remained. On the other hand the claim made people angry. They felt its force.'

Pusey himself only contributed eight Tracts to the entire series of ninety¹. Of these the first was on Fasting. The subject had been much in his thoughts for some time. On its appearance he wrote to his brother:—

'You will recognize it by the initials if not by the style. My object was to induce others to think on what I had thought on myself, or rather, since I had come to a result by long and careful thinking, and that, in conformity with the admonitions of our Church, I thought it my duty to state it. I feel some hope that, by God's blessing, it may have some tendency to promote a more humble, submissive, acquiescing frame of mind towards God, in these days of tumult, self-confidence, and excitement.'

An interesting account of the occasion of the Tract is given by Isaac Williams in his 'Autobiography':—

'Pusey's presence always checked Newman's lighter and unrestrained mood; and I was myself silenced by so awful a person. Yet I always found in him something most congenial to myself; a nameless something which was wanting even in Newman, and I might perhaps add even in Keble himself. But Pusey was at this time not one of us, and I have some recollection of a conversation which was the occasion of his joining us. He said, smiling to Newman, wrapping his gown round him as he used to do, "I think you are too hard on the Peculiars, as you call them. You should conciliate them; I am thinking of writing a letter myself with that purpose." "Well!" said Newman, "suppose you let us have it for one of the Tracts!" "Oh, no," said Pusey, "I will not be one of you!" This was said in a playful manner; and before we parted Newman said, "Suppose you let us have that letter of yours which you intend writing, and attach your name or signature to it. You would then not be mixed up with us, nor in any way responsible for the Tracts!" "Well," Pusey said at last, "if you will let me do that, I will." It was this circumstance of Pusey attaching his initials to that tract, which furnished the *Record* and the Low Church party with his name, which they at once attached to us all².'

¹ Tracts 18, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 77, 81.

² 'Autobiography of Isaac Williams,' pp. 70-72.

The value of Pusey's assistance and of the Tract itself was immediately recognized by Newman. He wrote to Froude on December 15: 'T. Keble, Harrison, Menzies, Perceval, and a more important friend who at present is nameless [N.B. this meant Pusey], have written for us.' And four days later, he says to Rogers: 'I have a most admirable Tract from Pusey, but his name must not yet be mentioned¹.'

The Tract is dated St. Thomas' Day, 1833, and does not appear to have been in circulation before the beginning of January. It is longer than any of its predecessors; partly because the writer could not easily express himself otherwise than at length, but partly also because it covers more ground, and more nearly exchanges the character of a fugitive composition for that of a theological treatise. It assumes, as not requiring proof, the duty of fasting on the part of Christians: as Pusey used to say, our Lord has settled that point for us in the Sermon on the Mount. But at the time of its appearance this feature of the Tract was made the ground of unfavourable criticism; and in fact Newman wrote a later Tract to supply the presumed deficiency². On the appearance of this 'younger brother' to his own work, to use Pusey's own phrase, he wrote to Newman:—

'Jan. 19, 1834.

'I was not prepared for people questioning, even in the abstract, the duty of fasting; I thought serious-minded persons at least supposed they practised fasting in some way or other. I assumed the duty to be acknowledged, and thought it only undervalued.'

In this, his first Tract for the Times, Pusey places himself in the position of a person unaccustomed to 'observe any stated fasts,' and who finds in the rules laid down by the Prayer-book on the subject the double character of practical wisdom, and a burdensomeness inconsistent with Christian liberty. The reasonableness of this last apprehension must, he says, be settled by experience: he will give his own.

¹ Newman's 'Letters and Correspondence,' ii. 8, 9.

² Tract No. 21: 'Mortification of the Flesh a Scripture duty.'

Fasting at times enjoined by the Church is a protection against the slothful and worldly habits of life which are agreeable to our natural selfishness. He compares the moral advantage of regularity in fasting with that of regularity in Church attendance and in reading the lessons ordered by the Church. Fasting, again, is closely connected with retirement and prayer, which is so necessary for 'real insight into the recesses of our nature, or for deep aspirations after God.' It thus enables us to resist the dissipating effect of an age of incessant activity; while it also suggests and makes easy the practice of a more self-denying extensive charity than is usual with modern Christians. Once more, fasting is a witness to the reality of spiritual things: 'he who endures hardship for an unseen reward at least gives evidence to the world of the sincerity and rootedness of his own conviction.' The Friday abstinence has a special value, as impressing upon the mind, week by week, the memory of our Saviour's sufferings. Of Lent, the Ember-days and the Vigils, he says much less; the restoration of the Friday observance being at the moment the most practical object.

It is impossible to read this tract without being profoundly impressed with the reality of the writer—of his religious convictions and life as the mainspring and warrant of his teaching. Indeed, this tract differs from its predecessors in the degree of emphasis which it lays on moral and experimental considerations. The earlier writers had insisted largely, and indeed necessarily, on the authority of the Church as a providential fact which, of course, ought to govern the life of the soul. Pusey too commends the rule of the Church, but less on grounds of authority than of experimental conviction. It is notable too that in this Tract he quotes both Richard and Goethe, names which do not suggest the tenets or the truths upon which the Tract-writers were usually insisting; and in some of his sentences we may feel the influence of Arndt, and even Spener.

Pusey sent copies of the Tract to his friends; it was variously acknowledged. The aged scholar, Bishop Burgess of Salisbury, welcomed it as 'a very interesting paper.' 'It has been read to me,' he added, 'and I heard it certainly with great pleasure, concurring most cordially with its sentiments.'

Arnold, of course, looking at the subject from another point of view, wrote very differently; but he evidently had still a more cordial feeling for Pusey than for Newman, and even than for his old friend Keble¹. Pusey was only in alliance with deadly error; the others were its prophets. The writer's estimate of the value of the ancient Church is not more correct than his prediction of the results of the movement that was going on at Oxford: and the whole letter prepares us for the bitter animosity of his later article on those 'Oxford Malignants' whom he found constantly in the way of his own revolutionary methods.

DR. ARNOLD TO E. B. P.

Rugby, February 18, 1834.

MY DEAR PUSEY,

I consider it very kind in you to send me the little tract which I received through Barker. It is very delightful to me to receive such a mark of your remembrance, and it would give me great pleasure to see you again either here or in Oxford. I am sure that there must be many points of unison still between us, without ascending to the highest of all: though by the form in which your tract appears I fear you are lending your co-operation to a party second to none in the tendency of their principles to overthrow the truth of the Gospel. Your own tract is perfectly free from their intolerance as well as from their folly: yet I cannot sympathize with its object, which has always appeared to me to belong to the Antiquarianism of Christianity,—not to its profitable history. . . . The admiration of Christian Antiquity seems to me to be the natural parent² of Puritanism, which calls all that is ancient Popery. The history and writings of the early ages of the Church have their use,—but it is an indirect not a direct one,—like the use of some of the historical parts of the Old Testament; that is, it will not furnish examples or precedents to be applied in the lump to present things: but it is a part of the great view of human and Christian nature, most rich in wisdom, like the individual experi-

¹ Cf. Stanley's 'Life of Arnold,' i. 313: letter to Hawkins.

² i. e. by the reaction which it produces.

ence of common life, to those who can draw the true conclusion from its manifold premisses,—but as a source for direct reference to common persons, often dangerous. I stand amazed at some apparent efforts in this Protestant Church to set up the idol of Tradition: that is, to render Gibbon's conclusion against Christianity valid, by taking like him the Fathers and the second and subsequent periods of the Christian History as a fair specimen of the Apostles and of the true doctrines of Christ. But Ignatius will far sooner sink the authority of St. Paul and St. John than they communicate any portion of theirs to him.

The system pursued in Oxford seems to be leading to a revival of the Nonjurors, a party far too mischievous and too foolish ever to be revived with success. But it may be revived enough to do harm,—to cause the ruin of the Church of England first,—and so far as human folly and corruption can, to obstruct the progress of the Church of Christ. And it does grieve me to see any whom I respect and regard connecting themselves in any way with such a party—the more so that they can never really be united with it; for every man who has sense and honesty enough to love Truth and to follow it for its own sake, will always be really hateful to the fanatical and superstitious, however they may be glad for a time to raise themselves on his shoulders.

Forgive this long dissertation, but your kindness in sending me your tract encouraged me to deliver my testimony, and I look to you as possessing qualifications too rare in England, the learning and independence of the Germans together with that spirit without which learning is nought.

Ever believe me, very sincerely yours,

T. ARNOLD.

It was not likely that Pusey would be influenced by such criticisms. He returned to the subject of this first Tract after the interval of a year and a half. A letter, signed 'Clericus,' appeared in the *British Magazine*¹, in which several questions were asked in connexion with the subject of Pusey's Tract. Some of these questions were certainly practical, arising naturally out of a serious effort to live according to the rule of the Prayer-book. Pusey felt that they deserved an answer. It appeared, first of all in the shape of a letter to the *British Magazine*², and shortly after in an enlarged form as Tract 66. As Tract 18 deals with the principle of fasting according to the Church's rule, Tract 66 discusses, in a very practical and moderate spirit, the details

¹ *British Magazine*, April, 1835.

² *Ibid.*, May, 1835.

of the duty. It is impossible, Pusey pointed out, to treat the Wednesday fast as obligatory in the English Church; it might be, for private persons, on occasion, edifying. Fasts and feasts may be observed on the same day; the one by the body, the other by the spirit. Rogation days were of value as preparing for the great festival of the Ascension. Publicity in respect of fasting, as savouring of ostentation, was condemned by our Lord: but it was necessary at times to own His claims in this as in other ways, although it might not always be possible to decline the invitation of an elderly clergyman to dinner, and there need be nothing in the intercourse of an invitation dinner inconsistent with the abstemiousness of a fast-day. The other points raised are discussed in the same spirit; and the Tract closes with a review of some prevailing prejudices against fasting, which shows that these prejudices, when thrown into a logical form, go much further than persons entertaining them would desire. In this way he disposes of the objections that fasting is not explicitly enjoined in the New Testament, that it is 'legal,' and that it is 'Popish.' Such a treatment of the subject was a symptom of a growing sense of the logical demands of Church principles.

In spite of the fact that Pusey considered himself at this moment independent of the other Tract writers, it is clear that Newman was already convinced that his sympathies were entirely with them. The appearance of the first volume of Newman's 'Parochial Sermons,' in March, 1834, constituted an epoch in the Movement; and that volume was dedicated to Pusey, 'in affectionate acknowledgment of the blessing of his long friendship and example.' The original dedication had been much more eulogistic, but, before publishing anything, Newman submitted it to Pusey, who returned it, altered, with the subjoined note:—

E. B. P. TO REV. J. H. NEWMAN.

[Early in 1834.]

MY DEAR FRIEND,

To the grammar of the enclosed I have nothing to say; but I hope that you will approve of the alteration which I have made in the

matter. I have allowed more to stand than I am entitled to ; for I have been learning, and trust, if it please God, all my life to learn of you (for through you I have learnt of our common Master), and I know not what you can have learnt of me. However since you have written it, it must have been so, and God must have taught you something *through* me : I hope He may realize it *in* me. Still I prefer what I have written ; it implies sufficiently what you *wished* to convey, without appearing to ascribe a superiority to me, which would be painful. I thank you heartily for this and all your other friendship. . . .

Ever your affectionate friend,

E. B. PUSEY.

A letter to his friend Jelf early in 1834 shows with what keen interest and clear apprehension of principles he was watching the anxious position of the Church :—

E. B. P. TO THE REV. R. W. JELF.

Ch. Ch., Feb. 16, 1834.

You will probably have thought the speech put into the King's mouth very trimming and contrived to leave ministers at full liberty to feel their way and shape their course accordingly. Such, from private accounts, appears to have been the case. Lord Bexley writes, ' I have some reason to believe that the Government, alarmed on the one side by the apparent rallying of the friends of the Church, and on the other, by the undisguised violence of some of the Dissenters, have for the present postponed their plan of Church reform, and mean to feel the pulse of Parliament, before anything is proposed, except some measure for the commutation of tithes.' Another account says that Lord Grey told the Dean of Chichester, Dr. Chandler, ' that the Dissenters had humbugged him ; that they told him that they wanted the reformation of the Church, and that he found that they wanted its destruction.' Strange that any one should have kept his eyes so long closed, or with so many indications for some time past of the real objects of the Dissenters, should have thought that their only motive was the wish for the purity of a church to which they did not belong. But although one is glad that their eyes are opened, and is very thankful for this respite, one can have but little hope from politicians who know so little either of the Church's needs or of the mode of relieving them. We may however thank God that we have been for a while at least rescued from the destruction which seemed to hang over us : a strong expression of love for the Church has been called forth by the violence of her enemies ; a great union of parties among the clergy ; numbers have withdrawn from the religious societies in which they used to act with Dissenters ; and now that the Branch for Foreign Bibles is being formed within the Christian Knowledge Society, I trust that this occasion of confounding Churchmen

with Dissenters and disuniting the Church will be removed. There is a magnificent opening if, by God's mercy, there be temperance, prudence, humility, earnestness, self-command ; but I have great fears (as perhaps I have expressed) lest our union be but apparent only, and those who have joined together against innovation from without, may separate if the question come what shall the Church herself do. Girdlestone, I regret, has committed himself by a very injudicious pamphlet on the comprehension of the Dissenters. He proposes alterations of things in themselves (1) advisable abstractedly, (2) indifferent, (3) such as we think better, but would give up for union. Among the first he places diminution of translations of Bishops, &c. (which I think it not becoming in Presbyters to discuss), the revision of some few passages in our Articles, in those especially (!) which concern the State, the omission of the Apocrypha and of the Athanasian Creed. I have given you the bad only. If ever the question of the Athanasian Creed came to be really agitated, I should now do what I might be enabled towards its retention ; for whatever might have been the case at the Reformation (and I suppose it was even then necessary) it could not, I think, now be given up without great danger of our becoming gradually a Socinian and ultimately a rationalizing Church. Although I should abstractedly have expressed the warning clauses otherwise, I do not think now that they could [be] omitted, probably scarcely altered, without giving countenance to the miserable indifferentism of the day, and creating in the minds of those who lean on the Church's judgement a doubt as to the degree of importance which she attaches to a right unspeculating faith in the Blessed Trinity. The object of G.'s pamphlet is good : he is in a mining district, surrounded by Dissenters, who have taken up the ground which the Church in the days of her supineness left waste—in the midst of people who, but for the Dissenters, would never have heard the name of their Redeemer ; and now he has the painful task of telling these persons that they are acting wrongly if they keep separate from the Church. I hope yet some means may be devised by which the Wesleyans at least may be reunited to the Church.

Burton has also just published a pamphlet, in which he gives up Church Rates (which in my mind is giving up an established Church), but in which [he] speaks out very honestly and boldly against the system of Dissenters, R. C.'s, &c., legislating for our Church, or determining, as in the Irish Bill, the number of our Bishops.

I wish I could write more, but even this I have written at the interval of some days (my head being too tired to finish it by return of post), and I am now too fatigued to go on. Dr. W. talks of our going to the sea next week, and I hope that we shall both return strong against next term.

Lord Grey said that he had no idea that the attachment to the Church was so strong. The lay Declaration is being very well signed.

Pusey's health was in fact again breaking down through the labour involved in the construction of the Arabic Catalogue. He was far from well when the Michaelmas Term of 1833 opened. 'Edward,' wrote Mrs. Pusey, 'would be in a bad plight, even were it the end of term instead of the beginning.' His lectures, however, began on October 24th, and, with the intermission of a week, he was able to deliver them regularly until his pupils went down. At Holton Park, however, where he spent Christmas with his mother, matters became more serious. He returned to Oxford on January 18th, and was to have preached at Christ Church on the 19th. He was unequal to the duty; his sermon was read for him by Archdeacon Clerke. It was, perhaps, inevitable that the Provost of Oriel, who had just been reading Pusey's Tract, should observe that Pusey 'must have been fasting too much.'

In the following week, he was peremptorily forbidden to lecture; and the prohibition was soon extended to the whole Term. His cough, which was sometimes violent, was the chief symptom of ill health. He was compelled to remain upstairs, and to refuse to see even Newman. He himself made light of the cough; it was 'of very little discomfort, except that it interferes with lecturing.' Ill as he really was, he nevertheless seems to have been busily occupied up to the day of his leaving for the Isle of Wight. He worked on steadily at the Arabic Catalogue. He saw no one, and read only a weekly newspaper; he thus had plenty of time at his disposal. He projected a 'tract on not keeping company with notorious sinners'; but had been too unwell to set about it. The day before leaving Oxford he wrote to Newman:—

'Feb. 24, 1834.

'I wished much to talk to you about many things, specially about the Sacrament of Baptism. Men need to be taught that it is a sacrament, and that a sacrament is not merely an outward badge of a Christian man's profession. And all union must I think be hollow which does not involve agreement in principles at least as to the Sacraments. Great good also would be done by showing the true doctrine of Baptism in its warmth and life: whereas the Low Church think it essentially cold. Could not this be done, avoiding all technical

terms? I know nothing or little as to the reception such a tract would meet with, but you have to decide whether holding back is Christian prudence or compromise.'

Here, clearly, we have the germ of the famous Tracts on Holy Baptism.

On February 25th, Dr. Wootten sent him to the Isle of Wight, where he remained until the middle of April. They first settled at Ventnor. 'But,' writes Mrs. Pusey, 'the distance from churches, and the difficulty of getting seats, induced us to emigrate.' They exchanged the noise and publicity of the small lodgings at Ventnor for a 'retired house, with five acres of pleasure ground,' belonging to Mr. Johnson, near Niton. The day was chiefly spent in the open air: Pusey delighting in the sea breezes, and his wife reading Silvio Pellico to herself, and Bonwell's life to him,—'not very admirable, perhaps, as a piece of biography, but his meditations and prayers are strikingly good.'

Pusey, to the end of his life, delighted in the presence of God, manifested in nature: the sea shore, the Malvern hills, the pines of Ascot, were all for him full of spiritual as well as physical enjoyment.

He describes his rest in the Isle of Wight to Mr. Benjamin Harrison, mentioned above, afterwards Archdeacon of Maidstone, who was at the time giving lectures for him in Elementary Hebrew, in a letter which also displays his early interest in the Eastern Church:—

E. B. P. TO REV. B. HARRISON.

Hotel Anglesea, near Gosport, April 8, 1834.

. . . We have been passing our time in most delightful seclusion at Ventnor, and near Niton in the S. of the Isle of Wight, scarcely hearing an echo, every now and then, of what is going on in the world. And it is to me far more satisfactory, to hear at once on a large scale what is going on or meditated, instead of the daily irritating process of hearing sentiments, projects, theories, all more or less unchristian. . . . It is delightful to be freed from the daily vexation of hearing all the ill which is meditated, and to be able to contemplate at a distance, what God seems to purpose, amid all the raging of the heathen or the vain

imaginations of the peoples. To me the apparent progress of Russia is a source of great delight : not that I have much hopes from an individual who prints the Koran for his Mohammedan subjects. He doubtless, in his heart, 'thinketh not so,' and I suppose is pursuing a course of mere human aggrandisement, but in the present dissolved and unenergetic state of civilized Europe, or energetic only about selfish and petty ends, or self-idolatry, I cannot but trust that the semi-barbarian power of Russia will render the same service in renovating our exhausted powers and spurious civilization, which the Goths did of old. Perhaps it may please God, that the Greek, including the Russian, Church may be purified by its contact with the Reformed Churches of the West, and that ours may recover some of its primitive power.

During his holiday Pusey had time to read those earlier publications of Newman which have for many years been classics. His remarks about them will be read with interest.

E. B. P. TO THE REV. J. H. NEWMAN.

Friday evening.

Anglesea Villa, Gosport, April 11, 1834.

MY DEAR NEWMAN,

I have delayed writing, at first because I had nothing decided to say of myself ; then, in expectation of your Sermons ; and lastly, until I should have read them : and now I expect to return so shortly that it seems hardly worth while to write, except that one can speak more of one's-self in writing. You will be kindly glad to hear that during the last ten days my health seems to have been making more progress than it had during the rest of my absence from Oxford, so that I should be almost ashamed to be here but for rather a discouraging letter from Dr. Wootten, founded on former reports. On this day week, however, I hope to return home, and in the next I trust to be permitted in some measure to resume my duties. This renewed illness and weakness makes me at times think that God does not intend me to do anything actively on a large scale (such as a large theological work) for His Church ; and that since I have been overfond of activity, i.e. intellectual activity, while I thought that His glory was more my object than it was, so now my chastisement will be that I shall [be] allowed to do nothing. Be it so : I only trust that my feeling of resignation is not the result of compelled idleness, or of a state of health, but that it really arises from the conviction that if I am to do nothing which appears lasting it is because, as things are, it must be better for the Church that I should not. With this feeling I shall at least proceed under the task of editing the Catalogue with a calmer mind ; since, at present, at least, it must be God's will that I should go on with it, and therefore He can have nothing of any

moment *now* for *me* to do for the Church, i.e. nothing which in my sight might seem so. Meanwhile, it is delightful to see Harrison making progress—*fungar vice cotis*: it seems almost to one's-self a fitting lot for inordinate and boastful energy to be allowed only to be active through others, and it is a mercy, far more than one deserves, if this is allowed to one. Enough, however, of self: one would not open so much of one's mind, except to one who I know makes mention of me in his prayers, and so I would gladly that he should know what to ask for.

I need not say that we have read your Sermons with deep interest. I should trust that to many a human being, they would open some of the secret places of his own heart, and tend, by God's blessing, to make him wise unto salvation. I have borne in mind while reading them that you referred me to them to see whether I should still press you to write the tract upon Baptism. Of your Sermons which I have read, that on 'God's Commandments not grievous' bears most upon it; but in truth I did not need any fresh knowledge of your views of Baptism: it was because I knew them, and had heard them formerly in conversation with you, that I wished you to write; and your mode of communicating instruction in these Sermons, which appears to me better calculated for reading than for hearing, certainly makes me wish the more that you would undertake it. On the Sermons I have nothing to remark, i.e. nothing to wish otherwise; some things I knew, the rest I felt, to be true; nor did it occur to me that there was anything which persons could misunderstand, even if they might, as I suppose many readers will, fail of understanding all: so I will only thank you for your affectionate feeling, which prompted the dedication, and for the volume itself, which we shall repeatedly study.

The Arians, I regret to say, remain where they were, i.e. I remain in them where I was: I had meant to analyze them for a periodical of Tholuck's, but I had some hope that he would become acquainted with them through Bunsen, who is going to Germany, so [I] desisted. My only objection was in point of style—that I thought here and there (yet only seldom) you had become Gibbonic; if I light upon a passage I will instance it to you. Your observations on the Judaizing Antiochian School might be illustrated by the Judaizing interpretation of Theodorus, &c.; the Antiochian interpretations appear to be the predecessors of the modern Rationalists and are those of the Jews: it is so strange and insulated a phenomenon in Christian antiquity, and so contrary to the general habits of mind of those times, that one seems entitled to infer a direct influence of the Jews (for instances vid. Rosenmüller): on looking at them again of late, I was startled by their presumption, although I had known them before. One judgement I should probably have passed more mildly—that on the Western Bishops who condemned Athanasius: it is easy for us to see that he was the champion of sound faith; but to a Latin, to whom, as you remark, it was so difficult to convey a right idea of the very subject of

the controversy, to whose habits of mind Athanasius, as far as he knew him, might very probably appear over-speculative, to whom, from the distance of the scene, his firmness might so easily be represented as refractoriness, or at the first, youthful excitement, or stickling about questions which to the mind of the Latin had never occurred as doubts,—these might be perplexities of which we, who have seen the issue of events, and that the uncompromising line of conduct was the only healthful one, perhaps can form no conception. I only name this for you to consider—not having studied the subject in the original sources I can form a very imperfect judgement: one cannot probably acquit them from having acted in a manner which whether it were right they doubted, and this of itself were sin. It is, after all, perhaps only a question of degrees of guilt; yet I think I should rather have insisted on the guilt of *any* compromise, or taken occasion to show how fatal and guilty a compromise might be, for which yet at the time there seems such plausible ground, not have represented their compromise as so great. As, however, I said before, I do not feel myself competent to speak on this subject. You will, I hope, go on with Church History.

We hear here rumours of preparations for war: I trust God will avert it. I am inclined to anticipate good from the growth of the enormous power of Russia: whether it is to be employed as the means of chastisement to Christian nations, or whether it is to break down the barriers of Mohammedanism, and so afford a readier entrance to the Gospel, or whether, which one feels to be certain, it is to serve purposes, of many kinds, and all unknown to us; in the rise of so gigantic a power one can hardly help anticipating a new era for the Church, and so one looks with thankful expectation to it. Of course, one feels assured, that if we war against it, our wars will serve God's ends either by hastening its progress if we are defeated, or by chastening its pride if successful. Yet I cannot help looking to her as an instrument of good, and therefore, besides the general miseries of war, I should hope on this ground that God would give to all nations, unity, peace, and concord.

William, who is with us, thanks you very much for remembering him in your kind present of your volume of Sermons: he would have thanked you himself had he known how; but he did not like to trouble you with a mere dry note of thanks, and yet he naturally would not take upon himself to make any observations upon your sermons. He has therefore begged me to express his very grateful thanks to you.

On Friday next I hope again to be amongst you: it seems so short a time after this long absence that one can scarcely believe that one is going to be restored to one's active duties so soon.

Maria begs her kind remembrances.

Ever, my dear Newman,

Your very affectionate friend,

E. B. PUSEY.

On April 15th Pusey returned to Oxford, and, in addition to his professorial and literary engagements, he found ready to his hands work of a kind in which much of his time was to be spent in after years. On March 21st Earl Grey had presented in the House of Lords a petition from certain members of the Senate of the University of Cambridge, praying for the abolition of every religious test exacted from members of the University before they proceed to degrees. It was signed by sixty-three residents. On the 24th of March the same petition was presented to the House of Commons by Mr. Spring-Rice. This petition was made the ground of a Bill, brought into the House of Commons by Mr. Wood, one of the members for Lancashire. When the House reassembled after the Easter holidays, both Universities petitioned against the Bill, but Oxford did a great deal more than send petitions to Parliament. First of all there appeared on April 24th a Declaration on the part of members of the University immediately connected with its instruction and discipline. It insisted that religion is the foundation of all education. Religion could not be taught on the vague and comprehensive principle of admitting persons of every creed. By religion was meant the doctrines of the Gospel as revealed in the Bible, and as maintained by the Church of Christ in its best and purest times, and, in these days, by the Church of England. Uniformity of faith on essential points was absolutely necessary for a Christian education, and the admission of persons dissenting from the Church would lead to unsettlement of younger minds, to controversy, and to the eventual enfeeblement or overthrow of all religion.

This Declaration was followed on the next day by a second Declaration of approval and concurrence, signed by members of Convocation and Bachelors of Civil Law not engaged in academical work. It comprised a great number of names who were a few years later to be ranged on opposite sides, but who now combined in defence of the existing system of the University. Then came

a second concurrent Declaration which was largely signed by the parents and guardians of resident students ; while petitions of a more general character were sent by members of the Church of England from various centres about the country. In promoting these expressions of opinion Pusey was not only associated with Newman and William Sewell, of Exeter College ; but also with Dr. Symons, Warden of Wadham, and with Dr. Faussett, Margaret Professor of Divinity.

To the first of these Declarations Pusey refers in the subjoined letter :—

E. B. P. TO W. E. GLADSTONE, ESQ., M.P.

MY DEAR GLADSTONE,

Oxford, April 25, 1834.

The enclosed, if you have not seen it, will interest you. The list comprises the names of the Theological Professors, and *all* the tutors except six. It has been followed up by another declaration of members of Convocation expressive of their full agreement with it : 150 signed it in 24 hours ; among them other professors, who did not think that they could sign ours, as not being engaged in theological education or discipline ; I name this in case it should be remarked on. The Heads of Houses were reserved also for the petition, and not invited to sign.

The chief point to be insisted upon appears to me the interference with the education of our own members in consequence of the proposed admission of Dissenters. We are to have no tests of the right faith of those who professedly belong to our Church in order that others may be admitted among us. Again, we are to have no public examination of their religious knowledge ; for, if ALL are to take a degree without a religious test, it would be mere evasion to put that test in the shape of the preparatory education. It should be known also that sons of Dissenters are actually admitted among us as conformists, i. e. such as can sign the Articles in the sense which the Bishop of Exeter has explained, and which is the sense in which they are signed ; and in this way, some have become valuable members of our Church. But the case will be wholly different if those are to be admitted who do actually dissent, and who come to be instructed in science or language, but in the only real Science come to dispute. Neither can the Bill stop where it is ; it is perfectly nugatory to abolish tests, while each individual college has the power of rejecting whom it will : the Dissenters will renew their application with redoubled force when the principle has been admitted : the first Dissenter whose son should be rejected from every college in Oxford, as

assuredly he would, would come before Parliament to urge them to realize their grant. This step taken, whatever persons may now think, they can never stop short of opening our Fellowships to Socinians, or dissolving. I trust that we shall be destroyed rather than corrupted.

Ever yours very sincerely,

E. B. PUSEY.

People appeal to Cambridge : I think it is strong evidence against them. I know, and I suppose almost every one has known, the case of individuals of unsound faith who, wishing to come to Oxford, have now gone to Cambridge, because they could not sign the Articles ; and the effect of their influence has shown itself doubtless in the tone of the clever Undergraduate Society, e. g. the Debating Society.

Pusey carried on a wide correspondence on the subject. Dean Ireland 'would act just as Pusey might suppose to be best for the credit of the University¹.' Sir Thomas Acland agreed with the general sense of the Declaration, but hesitated to sign it, on the ground that Dissenters had better be admitted as students of the University, on the understanding that they would conform to the discipline, and accept the religious instruction placed before them. The great majority of the replies would appear to have been in warm sympathy with the Declarationists.

The Bill passed the House of Commons by large majorities, of 147 on the second reading, and 89 on the third, the latter division being taken on July 28th. The debate which preceded the division had closed in a scene of wild excitement and uproar. The Bill was at once introduced into the House of Lords by Pusey's own relation, the Earl of Radnor. Lord Radnor contended that subscription on the part of an undergraduate 'was a lie, a positive lie.' Lord Carnarvon made the most effective speech against the Bill, which was also opposed by the Chancellors of the two Universities, the Duke of Gloucester and the Duke of Wellington ; and although it was supported by the Prime Minister, Lord Melbourne, and by Lord Brougham, then Lord Chancellor, it was rejected by a majority of 102 on the second reading.

¹ The Dean of Westminster to E. B. P., May 20, 1834.

Pusey had watched the Bill throughout with anxiety. In the House of Commons, Mr. Stanley had expressed a hope that it would receive emendations in Committee. It was really adopted as a whole by the House on the second reading. Referring to this, Pusey wrote:—

‘I am very glad that there is to be no tampering about the Bill. In this as in other matters, whatever God pleases to allow evil men to do with us, must be for the Church’s good; and I can view it calmly (not perhaps without a struggle between faith and sight), but if the Church countenances ill for the sake of preventing greater ill, we are destroying ourselves. The first, second, and third principle which I should be glad to see in every one’s conduct and heart now is, No Compromise, or, in other words, Loyalty to GOD come what will from man, or those spirits whose instruments bad men are.’

The great event at Oxford in the summer of 1834 was the installation of the Duke of Wellington as Chancellor. No such assembly of distinguished men had been welcomed by the University within her walls since the visit of the Allied Sovereigns in 1815. At the head of a long line of noblemen, and of eleven bishops, was the King’s brother, the Duke of Cumberland. His Royal Highness was the guest of Dr. Jelf, who had been for so long his son’s tutor, and who was now Canon of Christ Church. It had been at first proposed that the Duke should stay with Pusey, who was relieved when another arrangement was made, yet ‘feared that it might look like ingratitude.’ Pusey however had other guests, amongst whom were Sir Thomas Acland, and his cousin Lord Ashley, afterwards the well-known Lord Shaftesbury. The Installation Ode had of course a special recommendation for Pusey and his friends. It was composed by Keble, as Professor of Poetry.

Although Pusey was still in a very precarious state of health, he was obliged to remain in Oxford until the beginning of August in order to finish his Catalogue of the Arabic MSS. in the Bodleian Library. The description of the last manuscript was completed to his great satisfaction on July 24. But his health was a matter of no little anxiety to his relatives. His mother observed

that he 'continued to lose in weight ; and he could not afford to do this, being only 8 stone 9 lbs. as it was.'

He was to have spent the remainder of the vacation at Holton Park, but he was in fact sent to Ramsgate, in August. Just before leaving Oxford, he writes to Harrison on the prospects of the Church under the existing political situation :—

'I hear that J. Watson and others are very gloomy. There is an ominous silence in the new Government. It may be wrong to say so, but I cannot feel any fear about what the devil or man worketh against us. What I do feel gloomy about, is self-congratulation, self-panegyric, self-indulgences on the part of the clergy, or the self-styled defenders of the Church ; and that with so much over which to mourn or for which to be humbled.'

Again, on the controversy with Rationalism in Germany, he writes to Tholuck, who had been passing through a stormy time in Halle, which had been converted some years before by the teaching of the Rationalistic professors, Gesenius and Wegscheider.

E. B. P. TO PROFESSOR THOLUCK.

Christ Church, Aug. 4, 1834.

My brother tells me that you are disheartened at the state of the Church among you : there is very much, which one hopes that God may yet purify and exalt ; and I dread certainly the influence of the 'juste milieu' among you : it seems to me essentially a cold, self-conceited, and withal Rationalistic party : yet I cannot but hope that it may be a means of inviting over from Rationalism many, who when they shall have been brought thus far, will find no rest for the sole of their foot in it, and at last, betake themselves from the weary waste to the Ark, which is still open to receive them. It is not of course from them that one looks for the main increase of the right faith among you : yet I cannot but hope that here also, as in the heresies of the early Church, it may not be the *only* object of heresies, 'that they who are approved, might be made manifest among you,' 1 Cor. xi. 19. Perhaps also the victory over Rationalism might have been too easy and so have led to vainglory or some other defect, had there not been this severe disappointment and trial. But, however it be, it is God's world, and we must allow Him to govern it, and not be downcast, if He give not His own cause so speedy a victory, as we should have hoped and prayed for.

In the same letter he shows keen interest in a proposal of the S.P.C.K. to translate the New Testament into Hebrew, and writes as follows :—

‘My questions with regard to the Jews are :—

‘(1) With regard to the expediency of a good Hebrew translation of the N. T. I was inclined to think that a publication of the translation “in their own tongue wherein they were born,” and in their own character, would be best ; that a Hebrew translation was rather a compliance with conceit and pride ; and would not be wished for by those who were really disposed to seek the truth. An eminent Jewish convert (Herschell) whose judgement I am disposed to value, thinks that a good Hebrew translation would have a certain, although limited, use. My ground was that no Jews *think* in Hebrew.

‘(2) How would it be best to circulate the O. T. among them ? By a circulation of Luther’s translation, with the original interleaved (as has been tried, I understand, in Hesse and the Rhine country), in order to facilitate the quotations of missionaries ; or to reprint their own approved versions, such as are mentioned by Wolf, Biblioth. Hebr. ?

‘(3) How far would a Hebraeo-Arabic Bible be likely to be of use in the East ? About this I have some misgivings, for I cannot but think that the most likely mode of conversion will be by means of the Christian lives of those with whom they live, that where there are Christians, the residents of each country are the best missionaries ; that their light, shining before men, will be the best means of leading men to glorify their Father, which is in Heaven ; and that without this, any attempt to circulate the Bible will be of little use.’

Vacations were with Pusey always great seasons for letter-writing : his mind, released from the strain of exhausting work, largely mechanical, fell back upon subjects and principles which increasingly occupied and swayed it.

CHAPTER XIII.

DR. HAMPDEN ON SUBSCRIPTION—THE DOGMATIC PRINCIPLE—PUSEY'S DEFENCE OF SUBSCRIPTION—A DECLARATION PROPOSED—MR. GLADSTONE'S VIEWS—THE PROVOST OF ORIEL'S PAMPHLET—PUSEY'S REPLY—BLANCO WHITE, A SOCINIAN—CORRESPONDENCE.

1834-1835.

PUSEY returned from Ramsgate on St. Luke's Day, 1834, to preach before the University on the next morning. Of this sermon no certain trace survives. During the Term which followed, his interests were divided between the burden of his own work at Oxford and his eldest brother's canvass of Berkshire. Mr. Pusey issued an address to the electors, part of which concerned the Church, and provoked unfavourable criticism at the hands of his brother Edward, who feared that he was paying homage to the destructive tendencies of the time. Mr. Pusey 'thought it very important to call attention to the difference between the object of the Church, and the form of its constitution or legal architecture.' He was also anxious to promote the 'reconversion of Dissenters,' and with this view to substitute Milman's hymns for Sternhold and Hopkins in the Church Services. Edward Pusey's sympathies—odd as it appears to us, odd as it would have seemed to himself in later life—were warmly enlisted on the side of Sternhold and Hopkins. He certainly attributed to them an authority which they would not appear to have possessed. This claim his brother warmly disputed; he was himself deeply engaged partly in compiling, and partly in composing a new hymn-book of his own. And it was at this time that he composed

the well-known 'Hymn of the Church Militant' (as he called it), beginning with the words 'Lord of our life, and God of our salvation,' familiar to thousands of Churchmen, who little suspect its authorship¹. 'It refers,' he writes to his brother, 'to the state of the Church'—that is to say of the Church of England in 1834—assailed from without, enfeebled and distracted within, but on the eve of a great awakening.

But another subject more immediately affecting the deepest interests of the Church made the autumn of 1834 an anxious and busy time for Pusey. The debate in Parliament on the Bill for the admission of Dissenters to the Universities had brought before men's minds the question of undergraduate subscription to the Articles. An impetus in the direction of change was given by the appearance of a pamphlet by Dr. Hampden², who already filled an influential position in the University. He was Principal of St. Mary Hall, and had been elected to the Chair of Moral Philosophy, in the preceding March, although Newman had been a candidate. Hampden had been Bampton Lecturer in 1832, and if his lectures had not been 'listened to' or as yet 'read'³, he had nevertheless become in this way a kind of theological authority. He was steadily pushed into prominence by his far abler friend, Dr. Hawkins, the Provost of Oriel; who was indebted to him for coming to the rescue when Oriel had been deprived of its three most brilliant tutors by an act of arbitrary indiscretion, which would now find no defenders in any quarter⁴. Hampden's pamphlet, entitled 'Observations on Religious Dissent,' was an essential extract of his Bampton Lectures; and it was, if not an abler, yet a more attractive, as well as a shorter production; since time had allowed the lecturer's thoughts to run clear, or at least comparatively clear. Its central

¹ It is given, with slight variations, in *Hymns Ancient and Modern*, 214. It was one of the few modern hymns prized by the late Bishop Hamilton of Salisbury. A writer in 'Dict. of Hymnology' (p. 699) thinks, however, that it is based on a German hymn.

² 'Observations on Religious Dissent,' by Renn Dickson Hampden, D.D. Oxford, 1834.

³ T. Mozley's 'Reminiscences,' i. p. 351 (2nd ed.).

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 231.

position is that moral and theological truths are things distinct from religion ; that no 'inferences' ought to be drawn from the text of Scripture ; that the language of the Creeds themselves was thus a mistake, even although they express only what is taught by Holy Scripture. To the obvious objections to these positions which Holy Scripture itself furnishes, the writer scarcely attempts a reply, if indeed he is aware of their strength and urgency. But his pamphlet put the question of relaxing subscription on a new basis. Subscription was deprecated not only as inexpedient for very young men, but as involving a recognition of the value of Church formularies which appeared to the writer exaggerated. His conclusion of course went much further than the subsequent proposal put forward by the Heads of Houses. 'I do not scruple to avow myself favourable to a removal of all tests, so far as they are employed as securities of orthodoxy among our members at large.'

Here is the true key to Pusey's line in this controversy. Had the claim of dogmatic faith upon the conscience been recognized as a general principle, Pusey and his friends might have felt themselves better able to consider how far subscription to such a formulary as the Thirty-nine Articles on the part of very young men was the best means open to a Christian University of guarding the faith of the Church. The question was at least arguable ; but the practice had at any rate been consecrated by the usage of two centuries and a half, having been introduced by Elizabeth's Puritan favourite, the Earl of Leicester. But this lesser question of religious expediency was overshadowed by the far larger question of dogmatic truth, which Pusey and Newman saw coming, year by year, more clearly into view. In their eyes the threatened change was dictated less by the academical policy of Hawkins than by the theological bias of Hampden.

The general principle in which they were entirely agreed was stated, with his own inimitable clearness, by Newman, when writing some months afterwards to Perceval :—

‘January 11, 1836.

‘The advantage of subscription (to my mind) is its witnessing to the principle that religion is to be approached with a submission of the understanding. Nothing is so common, as you must know, as for young men to approach serious subjects, as judges—to study them, as mere sciences. Aristotle and Butler are treated as teachers of *a* system, not as if there was more truth in them than in Jeremy Bentham. The study of the “Evidences” now popular (such as Paley’s) encourages this evil frame of mind—the learner is supposed *external* to the system—our Lord is “a young Galilean peasant”—His Apostles, “honest men, trustworthy witnesses,” and the like. Milman’s “Jews” exhibits the same character of mind in another department. Abraham is a Sheik, &c., &c. In all these cases the student is supposed to look upon the system from without, and to have to choose it by an act of reason before he submits to it,—whereas the great lesson of the Gospel is faith, an obeying prior to reason, and *proving* its reasonableness by making experiment of it—a casting of heart and mind into the system, and investigating the truth by practice. I should say the same of a person in a Mahometan country or under any system which was not plainly and purely diabolical—the religion in occupation is at least a representative of the truth ; it is to him the witness of the Unseen God, and may claim, instead of scepticism and suspicion, a prompt and frank submission in the first instance, though of course the issue of the experiment would not be one of confident conviction, but of doubt, or of discrimination between one part of the system and another.

‘In an age, then, when this great principle is scouted, Subscription to the Articles is a memento and protest—and again actually does, I believe, impress upon the minds of young men the teachable and subdued temper expected of them. They are not to reason, but to obey ; and this quite independently of the degree of accuracy, the wisdom, &c., of the Articles themselves. I am no great friend of them—and should rejoice to be able to substitute the Creeds for them, were it not for the Romanists, who might be excluded by the plan you suggest of demanding certificates of Baptism and Confirmation :—still as it is even, we effect what seems to me a great point, which the mere substitution of certificates would not secure.’

The Heads of Houses as a body would have been far from agreeing with Dr. Hampden’s principles. But they had before their eyes the fear of public criticism and parliamentary action, and they were anxious to do something. On November 10, they passed a resolution adverse to the continuance of subscription to the Articles by undergraduates at their matriculation.

On the evening of this day, Pusey writes to Newman :—

‘You will have heard that the Heads of Houses have decided by a majority of one to displace the Articles from undergraduate subscription. I will gladly join in any measures which can be adopted to fight the battle efficiently in Convocation.’

Newman himself, three days afterwards, describes the situation, in a letter to Perceval :— ‘November 13, 1834.

‘We are in considerable anxiety here, the Heads of Houses having come to a resolution by a majority of one to introduce into Convocation some measure for “simplifying” the test at matriculation, i.e. substituting a Declaration of Conformity, &c., for Subscription to the Articles. Though directly accomplishing in this manner the avowed wish of Lord Brougham, &c., who say this is all they want, these strangely infatuated persons protest they mean to make no alteration, but merely place the University in a more defensible position as regards attacks in Parliament. They pretend the Duke has advised it. The chief movers in the business are the Provost of Oriel, the Principal of St. Mary Hall, Burton, and Denison of Merton. On the other side, Pusey and Sewell are firm and strong. This as regards Sewell is a very agreeable circumstance—one is glad to see him coming so right. About Pusey no intimate friend of his could ever doubt that he would be found on the right side, in any time of peril.’

In a letter to Hampden a fortnight later, Newman again expressed his sense of Hampden’s position :—

‘November 28, 1835.

‘The kindness which has led to your presenting me with your pamphlet encourages me to hope that you will forgive me if I take the opportunity it affords to express to you my very sincere and deep regret that it has been published. Such an opportunity I could not let slip without being unfaithful to my own serious thoughts on the subject;—while I respect the tone of piety in which the pamphlet is written, I feel an aversion to the principles it professes, as (in my opinion) legitimately tending to formal Socinianism.

‘And also I lament that, by its appearance, the first step has been taken towards an interruption of that peace and mutual good understanding which has prevailed so long in this place; and which, if ever seriously disturbed, will be succeeded by dissensions the more intractable, because justified in the minds of those who resist innovations, by a feeling of imperative duty¹’

Pusey at once set to work. It was difficult to attack the resolution of the Heads of Houses directly. But it

¹ Newman’s ‘Letters,’ ii. 77-78.

was easy to set men thinking about it. The plan of getting people to think before talking or acting had been the method of Socrates; and was eminently the method of the Oriel School. It had, indeed, been adopted with great success, sixty years before at Oxford, in relation to this very question of subscription. In 1773 a proposal to explain subscription by statute, as meaning only a general adherence to the teaching of the Church of England, was dissipated by a paper of nine questions¹.

Accordingly Pusey issued a fly-leaf of twenty-three questions, which appears to have been drawn up by himself originally, and then enlarged and corrected by Newman. The purpose of these questions is to set men thinking on the topics which were ignored or overlooked by the proposed innovation. They suggested the value of long prescription; the danger of playing into the hands of those who wished for larger changes; the importance of explaining rather than changing existing regulations, whenever possible; the religious advantages of subscription, as compared with those of a declaration, the former being exact and stimulating, the latter tending to religious indifference and laxity; the duties of the University, considered as a religious teacher, towards the young; and, especially, the danger of complying with the outcry that 'persons ought not to be required to sign that of whose truth they have not convinced themselves,' the fear lest they should 'strengthen the faulty notions of the day, which make private judgment everything, authority and the Church doctrine nothing.' These are, perhaps, the most important topics with which the questions deal: but they give no idea of the capacity of such a paper for setting people thinking upon subjects which were at that date, comparatively speaking, unconsidered. At the close of the week appeared a powerful pamphlet, 'Thoughts on Subscription,' by Rev. W. Sewell². Before however this could

¹ 'Letter to the Right Honourable the Lord North, Chancellor of the University of Oxford, concerning subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles,'

by Dr. Home. Reprint, Oxford, 1834, pref. p. 14.

² It is dated Nov. 17, 1834.

be circulated, the effect of the questions had become apparent. On Nov. 17, the Heads of Houses rescinded the resolution of the previous week.

E. B. P. TO REV. J. H. NEWMAN.

November 17, 1834.

We have now, I suppose, peace for a time, which is a great blessing. I conclude, namely, although I have heard nothing from authority, that the idea of substituting a declaration is at an end: the queries, especially one of yours, seem to have done their work. K., I suppose, will not want any copies now? Is he in O., and where?

Ever your affectionate friend,

E. B. P.

The subject was in fact disposed of for that Term; but the forces at work on the side of change were too numerous and too powerful to have been formally laid to rest. A new impulse was given to the controversy on March 6th, 1835, when the Earl of Radnor, who had taken charge of the Bill which had been rejected in the previous August, moved in the House of Lords for copies and translations of the oaths required of members of the University at matriculation, and when graduating as Bachelors or Masters of Arts. This motion roused opposition in other quarters at Oxford, besides those which were committed to a defence of the existing system. Eight days afterwards there appeared a 'Letter to the Earl of Radnor, by a resident Member of Convocation,' whose clear, cold, and incisive style of writing betrayed, at least to all resident Oxford, the pen of the Provost of Oriel. The Provost vigorously defends against Lord Radnor's criticisms the principle and practice of the University in dispensing with oaths in certain important cases; and he indignantly and successfully rebuts the constructive charge of perjury which Lord Radnor had brought against the University. But on the question of subscription to the Articles at matriculation, he is in agreement with his correspondent; and in this part of his letter he clearly has his eye on what had been recently urged by defenders of the existing practice, and in particular on Pusey's queries. 'The first

sons,' he says, 'who find leisure to write upon such questions, may be those who have the greatest talent, but at least experience¹.' The cause of the abolition of subscription was, he tells Lord Radnor, gaining ground in Oxford: if the University could be let alone, it would do much better for itself.

His last remark provoked a rejoinder in the shape of a Declaration, to the effect that eighty members of Convocation now in Oxford deprecated any substitution of a Declaration for subscription to the Articles as 'pernicious in itself, and of dangerous precedent.' This Declaration was signed by Pusey, Newman, and Keble; by Copeland, Mozley, and Sewell; but also by Dr Faussett, the Marston Professor of Divinity; by the Rev. W. W. Champneys and Rev. H. B. Whitaker Churton, Fellows of Brasenose; by Rev. John Hill, Vice-Principal of St. Edmund Hall. Four days afterwards a notice appeared, signed by the Chancellor, giving the form of a Declaration which was to be proposed to Convocation, in the ensuing Term, to take the place of subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles. The terms of the Declaration were as follows:—

I, B., declare that I do, so far as my knowledge extends, assent to the doctrines of the United Church of England and Ireland set forth in her Thirty-nine Articles; that I will conform to her laws and discipline, and that I am ready and willing to be incorporated in her Articles of Religion, as required by the Statutes of this University.'

It was moulded on a similar form which had approved of by some of the Heads of Houses in the preceding November; the changes were intended to conciliate religious opponents, so far as possible.

Its appearance was the signal for the renewal of the debate. The notice was dated April 1. On April 3 it again appeared on the scene with a new set of Twenty-seven Questions. They are based upon his earlier ones, but modifications, compressions, and additions have made them very different. They insist that a Declaration

¹ 'Letter to the Earl of Radnor,' p. 12.

involves a radical change in the religious discipline of the University; that it is, whatever men may say, a relaxation of the bonds which are implied in subscription; that the terms of the Declaration involve absurdity, since young men who are presumed to be too ignorant to understand the formularies are made to assent to the doctrines of the Church, so far as their 'knowledge' extends. The Declaration is contrasted with Subscription as bringing self into greater prominence; and as making the recognition of truth an act of compliance rather than a duty. The University being regarded as a body of Churchmen entrusted with the duty of propagating religious truth, the proposed change, in Pusey's eyes, involves at least a weakened recognition of that duty, while it foreshadows, not indistinctly, its eventual abandonment.

These 'Questions' were sent generally to members of Convocation. In acknowledging them, Mr. Gladstone wrote as follows:—

W. E. GLADSTONE, ESQ., TO E. B. P.

Hillingdon, Uxbridge, April 21, 1835.

MY DEAR SIR,

When I had the pleasure of seeing you, before the expiry of my short tenure at the Colonial Office, I forgot, in the hurry of our interview, to advert to the question referred to in your printed circular which reached me some time back.

What I have to say is little, and I write it with great diffidence; its sum is compressed in this, that I should feel inclined to vote against the proposed alteration, but not upon the same grounds as yourself to the full extent, though to a very considerable one. When your brother sent me, some time before, your sheet of queries, I endeavoured to explain the view of the subject which had approved itself to my mind.

The first *sine quâ non* with me would be, that the University should not be vexed by the interposition of Parliament. This upon every ground and not acting peculiarly as a member of the University. Next to this (in importance however first) and acting in this character, the most essential object seems to be, the maintenance of a Church of England education, and not only its maintenance as at present, but its consummation and perfection in your system. This being secured—fully and certainly secured, by whatever measures, and whatever degree of exclusiveness may be necessary to give this guarantee—it would give me pleasure to see Dissenters avail themselves, permissively, but to the utmost practicable extent, of our Church education,

and *therefore* to see removed, if it be the pleasure of the University and especially of its resident members, any subscription at entrance which is likely to form an absolute and insuperable bar to their becoming students in the University, at a period of life when they are probably little prejudiced in favour of Dissent, and therefore hopeful for the Church, but yet upon the other hand not prepared to make an absolute renunciation of it [Dissent] by a formal subscription.

I have said more of this than I intended, but it will enable me to despatch briefly the residue of the subject.

The Declaration now proposed would, it seems to me, be objectionable, as you urge, in sanctioning the principle now operative in a vicious excess, of lowering the tone of institutions to that of society, instead of the reverse process. And if we are to have a preliminary subscription I do not enter into the popular objections against the adoption of the Articles for that purpose.

But further, it seems to me that the change now projected would have the effect of rendering entrance into the University more difficult to Dissenters than it is at present. Many persons might subscribe the *Articles* without perhaps giving so much of a general sanction to the principles of the Church of England as would be implied in the Declaration. As I understand its terms, there is a *general* promise to conform to the Liturgy and discipline of the Church; this is not required at present, but only conformity within and for the purposes of the University. A Presbyterian for example signs our Articles, but would he with equal ease be able to make the promise just mentioned? The same would hold good of some classes of Dissenters in England.

I am sorry to have intruded upon you even to this length, but I could not suffer an application from you on such a subject to remain without notice.

Shall we be apprised of the day when the question will come on in Convocation?

Pray remember me to Mrs. Pusey, who I trust is well, and believe me,

My dear Sir,

Very sincerely yours,

Rev. E. B. Pusey.

W. E. GLADSTONE.

Convocation was to meet on May 20; and Pusey accompanied the announcement with a reply to Mr. Gladstone's letter.

E. B. P. TO W. E. GLADSTONE, ESQ., M.P.

[Christ Church], May 5, 1835.

MY DEAR GLADSTONE,

I have pleasure in believing that I agree in the abstract with you, thus far at least, that if the Church (i.e. pupils as well as instructors)

were in a sound state, I should rejoice that those who were not of the Church should come as Catechumens to her, without any pledge on their part, except what was expressed by the act of coming to a place of education. As far as Dissenters are affected by the present question (and it has been to me throughout but a subordinate part of it), my objection is not founded on any abstract unfitness of educating such persons together, but on the temper of the times, and of the Dissenters themselves. For the Dissenters profess to wish to come, *solely* for the sake of our civil education, setting themselves against our religious instruction, and with such an animus, you would feel that they could not be taught: again, the tendency of the age is to indifferencism, and that would be promoted by such a measure; but neither do I think the Church yet in a state to receive such pupils with safety to herself; with lax notions about the Church, vague and low and inadequate notions about the Sacraments, and sometimes very poor instruction in the great truths of Christianity, our pupils, as they are sent to us, could not be, with any regard to their safety, mixed up with Baptists, Socinians, or Roman Catholics, nor are we in a condition to carry on the controversy with the R.C.'s with advantage. I doubt not that the effect of the establishment of a R.C. College here would be a very considerable defection, especially among the Low Church. The aspect of the Church is, by God's grace, daily improving, but we are as yet in a very unsound, unsettled state.

But I have never thought of this question as with relation to Dissenters, nor should I have thought the Bill of last year, in any degree, so intolerable an evil, had it not prohibited the subscription even of the members of the Church. That subscription, in these days, I look upon as a decided benefit to the Church by promoting both a dutiful and teachable frame of mind, and an earlier knowledge of definite religious truth. Our schools are improving in the kind and degree of their religious instruction under this system; there is every promise of far more improvement, and though things are yet far from being what one should wish them, the solid improvement of Oxford within man's memory is said to be far greater than that of the rest of our country, and we have, I trust, every ground to look for far richer increase, unless in impatience at some remaining evil, we break up the system, instead of endeavouring to act up to it.

Ever yours very truly,

E. B. PUSEY.

Will you allow the inclosed to go with your second post letters?

I think that we trusted to you to inform (I believe your father) T. Gladstone, Esq., M.A., of the things now agitated here, and which (though one magnifies what one is one's-self concerned in, still) as being a question of principle, will I think much affect the country ultimately.

Mr. Gladstone replied :—

MY DEAR SIR,

Albany, May 14, [1835].

I am very happy to be the depositary of any of your sentiments on the interesting question now to be agitated in Convocation, and yet more so to find that they are in such material points concurrent, if I do not presume in saying so, with my own. I advert particularly to that consideration which seems to be very prominent in your mind, of the great importance of subscription to the members of the Church ; for I do feel most strongly the necessity of putting forward the Articles as a definite basis of teaching and of belief, and of keeping the religious instruction of the University in a fixed form, as the only effectual means of preserving its unity and substance.

So far however as regards evil or danger to be apprehended from the contact of the Dissenters, I fear that if we are to wait until the whole body of Churchmen is in such a state that all will be individually as well as collectively secure against labefaction, the prospect of relaxing the entrance will be indefinitely removed. May it not be a question—whether the study of Church principles, as well as the progress of religion in the great body of individuals professing adherence to the Church, would not be rather quickened by the jealousy for her ensuing upon the apprehended proximity of Dissenters ?

I have mentioned to my brother the day of your vote in Convocation. Whether we may be able to go down I do not know, and I hope you will not attribute it to lukewarmness if, in the present state of public affairs and also in the prospect of your having votes to spare, I do not send you a decisive answer at the present moment.

Pray remember me to Mrs. Pusey, and believe me,

My dear Sir,

Very sincerely yours,

W. E. GLADSTONE.

Rev. E. B. Pusey.

The 'Questions' were sent among others to the Provost of Oriel, who 'reprinted them with a few brief hints'¹, as to the sort of answers which, in his opinion, might properly be given to them. These 'hints' are, it need hardly be said, very good reading ; they sparkle with the dry and clear acuteness characteristic of the writer. But they do not really grapple with the serious thoughts which Pusey

¹ 'Oxford Matriculation Statutes. Answers to the "Questions addressed to Members of Convocation by a Bachelor of Divinity," with brief notes

upon Church authority, &c.,' by a Resident Member of Convocation. Oxford, Baxter, 1835.

had at heart. They resolutely put out of sight the history and the real drift of the new proposal, the influences which had led to it, the large and far-reaching effects which it might be expected to have. The Provost especially attempted to make capital out of the 'many and various senses put upon the present subscription' by its defenders¹. Upon this criticism Newman observed:—

‘May [13], 1835.

‘As to H.’s objection in the notes that explanations of subscription given by its defenders are so various, even if the quotations bore him out, it would seem to me very shallow. His business (to be fair) would be to see if there was not some *one essential deep argument* running through them. No two individuals give the same ground of conviction for the most acknowledged truths. Ask a dozen educated persons their respective reasons for the belief in a God;—or again their mode of reconciling St. James and St. Paul; or again to analyze the peculiar beauty of a certain passage in Shakespeare or to criticize the character of Hamlet,—how triumphantly might one show them up to ridicule! show that St. Paul was diametrically opposed to St. James, and that Hamlet’s character was a mere extravagance!’

Pusey in his turn dealt with the Provost as the Provost had dealt with him. He reprinted his own Questions and the Provost’s replies, and now added notes of his own on those replies².

The difference between his way of looking at the matter and that of the Provost appears in the titles of their respective pamphlets, which not merely deal with the same subject but contain to a large extent the same words. The Provost’s title is, ‘Oxford Matriculation Statutes’; Pusey’s ‘Subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles.’ Pusey’s first thought was for the Faith of the Church; the Provost’s for the improved system of the University.

The leading point which Pusey makes in his notes is

¹ ‘Oxford Matriculation Statutes,’ p. 25.

² ‘Subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles. Questions respectfully addressed to Members of Convocation on the Declaration proposed as a Substitute for the Subscription to the

Thirty-nine Articles by a Bachelor of Divinity, with Answers by a Resident Member of Convocation, and brief notes upon these Answers, by the Bachelor of Divinity.’ Oxford, Baxter, 1835.

that the Provost does admit the Declaration to mean less than Subscription meant, and that the proposed change is therefore a relaxation. And such a relaxation is, he concludes, a menace and a snare. It is a snare for tender consciences,—an opinion which in later years he expressed in the same terms of the new formula of clerical subscription,—and it is a menace of future and more disastrous change in the direction of abandoning all allegiance to the teaching of the Church.

A more personal matter connected with Pusey's share in this controversy had a deeper significance, and was not without its bearings on important events which shortly after followed. In his 'Questions,' Pusey had stated that Dr. Hampden was 'the first advocate of the proposed measure'; that he was favourable to much wider changes beyond; that, although 'himself a Christian,' he 'put the Unitarian on the same footing precisely of earnest religious zeal and love for the Lord Jesus Christ, as any other Christian.' In the letter already quoted the Provost goes on to say that 'as to Hampden, he had nothing whatever to do with suggesting, or moving, or preparing the present Declaration.' 'It is true,' he adds however, 'that I have had a great deal to do with the present Declaration; you are wrong in supposing that it is properly mine.' Pusey, of course, was not concerned only or mainly with the precise words of 'the present Declaration,' but with the substitution of any Declaration at all for the ancient practice of Subscription; and Hampden was certainly the first member of the Board of Heads of Houses, which then was the initiative body in the University, who had raised the discussion which resulted in the present proposal.

Upon the theological question the Provost felt more warmly. He complained that Hampden's name should have been introduced at all. The passages concerning the Unitarians had been misapprehended. Hampden had complained that the Unitarians were 'egregious dogmatists.' For his part, too, the Provost thought some of Hampden's opinions on 'Tests, Creeds, and Articles,'—'dangerous

and unsound.' Pusey insisted on the significance of Hampden's statement about Unitarians. How could a Unitarian feel 'precisely the same religious zeal and love for our Lord Jesus Christ,' as those who believe that He is GOD, and that His Death is an atonement for human sin? It was a question of religious belief, not of theological dogmatism¹.

Here the matter rested until May 20, when Convocation threw out the proposal of a Declaration by a decisive majority—459 votes against the change, and 57 for it. The defeated party were much irritated. Pusey's later Questions had, it was plain, been not less influential with Convocation in May than his earlier Questions had been with the Hebdomadal Board in the preceding November: and the Questions which had had most influence with voters were those which pointed to a connexion between the proposal and Hampden's pamphlet. Not that Pusey was alone in connecting Hampden's name with the academical question. Two other pamphlets, at least, had done the same thing²; but they were by persons of less prominence in the University.

On the day upon which Convocation recorded its decision Hampden wrote to Pusey: 'Having heard them [the Questions] generally imputed to you in the course of this morning, I feel myself called upon to make the enquiry of you whether you are the author of them or not?' The use of his name, he urges, had been 'very impertinent and unfair.' He could no longer regard in the light of a friend or acquaintance, one who under the cover of an anonymous signature could throw out such 'unwarranted scandals' against him.

Pusey replied that he had signed all the copies of

¹ 'Subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles, &c.,' p. 27.

² 'Latitudinarianism in Oxford in 1690. A page from the Life of Bishop Bull.' Oxford, Baxter, 1835. 'The foundation of the Faith assailed in Oxford; a letter to His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, by a

Clerical Member of Convocation.' London, Rivington, 1835. Of these, the first, according to the Rev. Dr. Griffiths, late Warden of Wadham, was by the Rev. Benjamin Harrison: the second by the Rev. H. W. Wilberforce.

'Questions' which he had sent out; that if he had not printed his name, it was because he did not desire to dictate to the University; and that he could not understand how quotations from Dr. Hampden's public language could be 'unwarranted scandals.' Hampden replied in very angry terms. Pusey's letter was dictated by vain pretension: his Questions were 'nonsense'; his excuse for not printing his name on them was ridiculous. He advised Pusey to examine himself more before venturing to fling imputations of religious unsoundness on others. The flattery of a *party*, he added, was not a fair criterion of a claim to orthodoxy.

Pusey was distressed by Hampden's annoyance, and he seems to have asked the Provost of Oriel, as a friend of both, to bring about a better understanding. But nothing that Pusey could honestly say would appear adequate even to the Provost: although the Provost, with characteristic candour, remarks to Pusey:—

'One thing I am certainly bound to give you full credit for, which is your patient endeavour after repeated trials to make some reparation of what I considered an injury, though you could not see it to be so yourself¹.'

In truth, behind the question of academical discipline there lurked a far more serious issue which the course of events would bring to the front, and that within the next few months. But for the present the controversy on academical subscription was settled. Lord Radnor introduced another bill into the House of Lords which came to nothing. The existing system of subscription, even at matriculation, lasted on for twenty years, until it was finally abolished at the first great instalment of change in 1854.

During the later phase of the controversy on subscription, an event had taken place, of tragical interest in itself, and intimately present to the mind of the leading controversialists at Oxford. The Rev. J. Blanco White became

¹ Provost of Oriel to E. B. P., May 27, 1835.

a Socinian at the close of January, 1835. His residence in Oxford, from 1826 to 1832, had placed him on terms of affectionate intimacy with Newman and Pusey on one side, and with Hawkins, Hampden, and Whately on the other. They all admired his moral courage and disinterestedness, as well as the strength and acuteness of his understanding. In the earlier days of his Oxford residence, he had taught Pusey, Wilberforce, and Froude the order of the Breviary¹. But his mind was setting steadily in a latitudinarian direction; and although in the election of 1829 he had sided with Pusey, it was a political rather than a theological alliance, and he was opposing Newman and Keble. His true mental kinship was with the latitudinarians. He was generally believed to have inspired Hampden with the main ideas of his Bampton Lectures. He had a particular attraction for the most moderate member of the school, the Provost of Oriel: and since 1832 he had been an inmate of Archbishop Whately's household at Redesdale, near Dublin; he was in part tutor to the Archbishop's son. Great was the consternation, and sincere the distress when, in the beginning of 1835, this gifted man announced his conversion to Socinianism, and, in fact, deliberately attended the Socinian service for the first time on January 25th. The Archbishop and Hawkins, Newman and Pusey, all wrote to him. Archbishop Whately apparently persuaded himself that Blanco White's mind had been affected by his bodily health; Blanco White's letters do not sustain this impression. The Provost of Oriel advised him to consult Whately and Copleston. In a reply of marked ability, he tells the Provost that 'his present theological convictions were of very long standing; that his notebooks attested the long and frequently resisted process by which he had gradually rejected the doctrines of the Trinity and the Atonement, in the sense of vicarious suffering and original sin; that with respect to the Divinity

¹ Blanco White's 'Journal,' quoted in Mozley's 'Reminiscences,' vol. i. p. 359, 2nd edition.

of Christ he had during the greatest part of his residence in Ireland silenced his conscience by means of those verbal evasions which afford a shelter to some really conscientious, but doubting, persons in the Church.' He would save his friend the Archbishop 'all perplexity between affection to himself and official deference to the intolerance of orthodoxy.' He left Dublin.

Pusey appears to have written to him again some three months after, in the hope that a return to faith was still possible ; but Blanco White's replies completely dissipated any such expectation.

Blanco White had no followers ; but the indirect results of his act were very great indeed. It seemed to be a living illustration of the logical outcome of Hampden's anti-patristic teaching. It strengthened the resistance to any attack on the principle of Subscription. It gave a new impulse to the theological Movement which was at the bottom of that resistance, by demonstrating, in the case of a man of great power and accomplishments, the difficulty of maintaining an intermediate position between the Creed of the Church and the repudiation of the essential features of God's Revelation in Christ. Its influence, great if indirect, is traceable in not a little of the literature and in more than one career which was identified with the Tractarian movement.

Far different from these exciting discussions are the following letters written in the midst of them. On sending a print of Sir J. Reynolds' picture of 'The Infant Samuel' to his god-daughter, he writes a letter which shows how a scholar and a controversialist may understand and help very young children.

E. B. P. TO HIS NIECE, EDITH PUSEY, DAUGHTER OF PH. PUSEY.

Christ Church, Saturday evening, March 21, 1835.

MY DEAR NIECE,

I love very much the picture which I sent you by your papa, and I love you very much, and so I sent it to you. The little child, whose picture it is, lived a long while ago ; he loved God more than anything else, and God made him a very good and a very great man,

and praised him in His own book, the Bible, so that all good people now love and honour little Samuel. His mother gave him to God, when he was a very little child, and as he grew older, he was very willing to learn of God, and to do all which God told him, so God told him more and more : and God does so now to us. The more any one does what God bids, so much the more does God teach them, and it is a very happy thing to be taught by God. You see little Samuel is now on his knees, praying to God ; God in those times showed where He was, by a great light : you see the little boy is looking straight at it ; he is not looking about him, or thinking about other things, but while he prays to God he is thinking about God only. That little boy is now in heaven, where God is, to Whom he prayed, and he is very happy ; your papa and mama gave *you* to God, when you were much less than that little child : God made you His own child, and Jesus Christ loves you, for He became a little child like you, and died, in order that you might be God's child. If you pray to God always, as this little child did, God will always love you ; now while God loves you, He will not let any one do you any real harm, but He will keep you quite safe, and by-and-by, He will take you, where He is Himself and where you will never cry, but be always happy. I always pray to God for you every night and morning, that you may be a good child, and love God more and more, and then you will be very happy.

God bless you, my dear Edith, prays your loving uncle,

EDWARD B. PUSEY.

As I am very busy, your aunt Maria printed this for you ; she would have done it sooner, only God thought it best for her that she should be ill, so she could not do it.

Another child—in the family of Dr. Wootten—died two days before the struggle in Convocation on the question of Subscription. Pusey describes her last illness in a letter to his brother William :—

E. B. P. TO W. B. PUSEY, ESQ.

May 18, 1835.

I have kept this letter a day or two, but besides Lectures, &c. I have been finishing *Notes* on the Provost's Answers to my Queries. Maria (now better) has not been well ; and, expecting Tholuck's visit, I have been more anxious to give additional time to my little charges. One of them, the youngest, Alice, fell asleep this morning : anything more beautiful than everything which I have seen in her for these three weeks, I cannot imagine ; it was a privilege to be with her ; every action and word seemed to proceed from some principle of duty and love ; with full and deep consciousness of past sin, and full

and entire dependence upon her Saviour, she yet was for some time past kept free from sin : about a week or ten days ago, I recommended to her the prayer of our Church, 'Keep us this day without sin,' as what we might hope should be fulfilled, if we asked in faith. She was truth itself and knew herself, and so I could dare to ask her whether she thought that God had so preserved her, and she answered, Yes. And I do believe that since she received the Blessed Sacrament, perhaps during all this illness, she had been kept free from sin even here, and was already a holy angel, before she parted from among us. It was beautiful to see how faith and humility were blended in her : it was a realizing of the words, 'I can do all things through Christ, who strengtheneth me.' She felt herself nothing, and yet believed that God could do all in her, and for her, and by her. I reminded her but yesterday, that active life had many more temptations than her sick bed, and asked what she should do, if God placed her again in the midst of it. She said (with the deepest humility) that she thought that God could keep her in the midst of these trials also. However tired of other things, she had always been animated and refreshed when spoken to of the things of God. And now her warfare is accomplished, and she with her Saviour and her God. May God grant, for His Son's sake, that those we love may die with the same faith, humility, obedience.

At a somewhat earlier date, during the Easter vacation, but when the air of Oxford was full of controversy, he answers a request of Rev. B. Harrison that he would criticize a sermon, the sketch of which was enclosed :—

E. B. P. TO THE REV. B. HARRISON.

Christ Church, April 16, 1835.

I like the sketch of your sermon, although I have little more time than to tell you so, and I think it is a subject which our age and its theology both in its depths and its shallows needs to have brought before it. You, however (as far as your sketch extends), have only addressed yourself to one part of its shallows, the commonplace matter-of-fact philosophy, whereas, I think, with your congregation, you ought to take in two other classes of the Low Church, who appear to me generally to carry their ideas of corrupt human nature too much into the new man, and to think that, because we are by nature infected with evil, and have ourselves gone yet further astray, therefore we are incapable of rising to any great height of holiness (though it be by God's free gift, and not of ourselves). They seem almost to look upon it as derogatory to Christ's Atonement, if we are represented as any other than weak, miserable, sinning creatures, who are to go on sinning and polluted unto our lives' end : forgetting

that since it is not ourselves, but God Who maketh us holy, all boasting and all self-righteousness is excluded by the very conditions, so that I suspect that there lies, unknown to these good persons, a stronger idea of human agency than they themselves are aware of, that they depreciate human actions because they think too much of it as human. However, the result I think is, a miserably low standard of human attainment, or rather a want of faith as to what God can and has and does work in man, if he gives himself up to Him; they think principally of God united with man for our Redemption, or of Christ's being at the Right Hand of God to make intercession for us, but they do not think of that almost more stupendous mystery, man united with God, our human nature (which has not been vouchsafed to angels) united with our God, and all the high inconceivable privileges thence ensuing. So that I think the Ascension well calculated to correct in this way the faulty theology of the day. (2) The other class, to whom I think it might well be applied, though carefully, would be to young men, and in fact to most of us, as a motive for shaking off this drowsy, sleepy state in which men live on, more or less immersed in the things of this life, as if they belonged to this world, were a part of it, whereas their nature is now united with its and their Creator. The dignity of our nature, not as it is in us, but as it is united with Christ, and consequently in us also as His members, is a frequent theme with the ancient Fathers, and must be again with us, if we would bring men (I do not mean those wilfully blind, but the half-awake) to consider in good earnest what is the hope of their calling. On the present system, we shall never build up Christians. In short, 'I would make the conclusion' apply to our deficient practice, as well as to the unchristian theories prevalent among us. The rest I like.

Keenly as Pusey from time to time engaged in controversy, it never made him forgetful of the claims of personal religion whether in others or himself. His motive was a belief that the honour and will of God, as distinct from any selfish purpose, made it necessary. Accordingly it did not disturb that calm and assured sphere of spiritual interests which lies beneath the outward activities of a good man's life, nor obscure the sight of those eternal verities of which all theology is the formal expression.

APPENDIX TO CHAPTER XIII.

REV. E. B. PUSEY TO PHILIP PUSEY, ESQ., M.P.

MY DEAR PHILIP,

Ratley, Jan. 28, 1835.

Many thanks for your information, and for your offer to put me into communication with Sir R. Peel. On the whole, I think it best to do nothing ; and that mainly on the ground that, as he is, I suppose, in communication with the Bishops, and is going to do what he proposes with their sanction, the subject would, if they like it, come from them ; if they do not like it, I should not of course wish to name it. It is also too wide a subject, especially as much thought has not been bestowed upon it, to be matured, as a *πάρρηγον*, amidst such an extensive scheme of change, as that now brought forward. All that I should wish, would be that Sir R. P. should not so far commit himself, or so divert Cathedral property from its original purposes, as to render it impossible hereafter to realize this portion of them : there would be so much to arrange in the details of such a plan as mine, that I should hardly think that it could be satisfactorily prepared by the beginning of the present Session.

With regard to the proposed plan of alteration of Church incomes (for Church Reform it cannot be called), one can say nothing without seeing its details ; there is a mode of applying Chapter property to improve small livings, which I not only think just, but which ought, I think, to be made compulsory, without reference to so-called 'existing interests' ; and that is, the increase of the incomes of the cures intrusted to them and where they received the tithes, with the intention that they should provide for the spiritual needs of the district. In all such cases, if they have neglected their trust, or from circumstances been unable to realize it, I think that the State ought to enforce its execution ; and I should be glad to see a Bill on the plan of the Archbishop's *enabling* Act, requiring Chapters to endow their poorer benefices in certain proportions, according to the population : if the population were large, I would make the Chapter form two or more benefices of proportionate income. A plan of this sort, as far as our Chapter is concerned (which is the only one with whose details I am acquainted), would certainly do far more good, and be much more effective than any other, while it enforced a principle and disturbed none. If the income of the several Canonries should by this measure

be reduced below what was thought expedient, *then* I would set apart a stall or two for this purpose, but all this I have sketched in my second edition. But a mere indefinite plan of reducing the incomes of cathedrals, *merely* because income is wanted for other places, would be but just in the character of the present day: our ancestors had magnificent ideas of what was necessary for the service of God, and we have pigmy ones; and so because another set of men plundered and squandered Church property, and *we* find it inconvenient to restore it (although we think nothing of National Galleries, Museums, &c.), part of their magnificence is to be melted down in order to provide for the necessary wants which we have no mind to provide for. It may be that statesmen have, under the House of Hanover, so grossly abused their trust as to the disposal of Canonries, and that this system of abuse may be so ingrained, that it may please God that they should be abolished; but this alters not their action, who are unconscious instruments only in His Hand. One only thing, I hope, that, if existing interests only are regarded, a large body of clergy will have nothing to do with so odious a distinction, but at once declare that what is sufficient for their successors, will suffice for them, and will not allow themselves to be, or to be held up as, the impediments to the wider extension of the blessings of parochial cure. Some such act of self-denial might have its use in these self-indulgent times.

One point in the plan did strike me as less pigmy-minded; and this was the hint that if the partial aid of Chapters did not suffice, then some measure might be adopted for applying to the State to provide better for our large towns; but how this is consistent with the so-called 'relief' of Dissenters from Church Rates, I understand not: I hope that it is not held out as a bribe to Churchmen.

The first edition of my 'Cathedral Institutions' I did send to Sir R. P.; I should have no objection to sending the other, or you could convey it with my respects, and direct his attention to those parts which were most to the point, as he has very little time for reading; if the proposed measure emanates from him with the sanction of the Bishops, then perhaps they might wait for him to propose any measure to them, and themselves determine not to originate anything: as indeed, it seems a strange scheme for a layman to propose the arrangement of Episcopal Dioceses, and our hybrid House of Commons an odd ordeal for it to go through without any previous sanction of the Church.

I am glad all colds are well. My m[other] would be obliged to you to open the return letter from Mr. Hoare, and frank the notes and a note from the Porter in one cover to her.

Ever your affectionate Brother,

E. B. P.

We mean to return to Ch. Ch. on Friday morning. Will you send the enclosed by second post?

CHAPTER XIV.

THOLUCK'S VISIT TO OXFORD—STUDIES ON THE SACRAMENTS—CHRIST CHURCH BUSINESS—CHURCHES IN EAST LONDON—THE THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY—ASSISTANCE TO GRADUATE STUDENTS OF THEOLOGY.

1835-1836.

IN May 1835 Pusey's old friend Tholuck visited him at Oxford. He was to arrive on Saturday, May 16th. He was in bad health, and brought with him a companion, Herr Müller. He stipulated for permission to go to bed at ten o'clock, and to sleep in a room 'in which absolute silence reigns at that time.' In the matter of meal-times, he had already brought himself to conform to English habits; they were, he thought, the best for literary men as well as for men of business. He did not wish for company, but did not object to it. He should prefer the company of Pusey himself to that of other Oxford divines. Pusey would understand him better. But he particularly wished to see Dr. Buckland and 'his programme about the explanation of Genesis.' When Tholuck arrived in Oxford he was in good spirits. He had spent pleasant evenings at London House and at Lambeth. He had met Mr. H. J. Rose, but 'was angry with him on Pusey's account; he had been clumsy, and ought to have expressed his repentance.' He had derived a special pleasure from a minute examination of the *Codex Alexandrinus*.

Of the visit itself no details survive. But six months afterwards, on returning to Halle, Tholuck wrote to his 'beloved friend' an account of some of his impressions.

'November, 1835.

'Believe me it is sweet to my heart to write to my friends, and doubly sweet to write to you whom I so sincerely honour. From your

home I have carried away with me a deep impression that you and your house serve the Lord, and that your names are written in heaven. Ever shall I bear in mind, with heartfelt gratitude to God, the hours spent in your company. May He especially and long preserve to you the devoted companion who is the faithful and high-minded partner of your life ; I can understand your possessing in her the fullest comfort that earth can afford in many a trouble. May He hear my prayer.'

During his visit to Oxford Tholuck, as was natural, had met Pusey's more intimate associates. He writes to Pusey:—

'Remember me to your friend Newman. Some of his sermons have indeed edified me. Such a transparent, holy mind ! My prayer is for a blessing on your wife and children, on your own dear self, on the University of Oxford, on the Church of England, on all who love the Lord Jesus.'

Tholuck's warm-hearted devout nature had been deeply shocked by the recent appearance of Strauss' first '*Life of Jesus*,' and by recent developments of rationalistic criticism of the Old Testament. He speaks of it as follows :—

'The fate of the English Church always interests me as much as that of the German. I feel most deeply how she is robbed, and how she struggles on. Yes, my friend, a crisis is more and more developing itself, in which, as never before, a people of God and a people of Satan are on opposite sides. Let me tell you something about this from Germany. The most educated people are increasingly partisans of the philosophy of Hegel ; and while some few adherents of this system do seek Christ, the majority now unhesitatingly call themselves Pantheists. A tutor of the Hegelian school, Strauss of Tübingen, has published a "*Life of Jesus*," in which he groups together, with great brilliancy and acuteness, all the historical discrepancies which have ever been discovered, and indeed adds some new ones also. Thus this history looks like a purely arbitrary construction,—like a myth. The book has made a deep impression on all minds that are not altogether, and by the way of experience, fortified in faith. A new epoch will date from it. The result is this : we know nothing historically certain about Jesus, except that he lived as a sort of Jewish prophet. Hereupon follows the author's own profession of faith. He is a Pantheist ; and the time, he thinks, has come when everybody should throw off the mask, and the Christian Church, as such, should cease to be. You cannot think what a profound impression is made by this book ; many waverers now turn with decision to that side of the question. Besides this, in our literary periodicals, we already read pantheistic confessions of faith : they only now care to clear themselves

of the charge of being materialistic pantheists. At the same time there have appeared books by Vatke, Bohlen, Lengerke, Hitzig. They are partly of a frivolous character. They carry the negative criticism of the Old Testament to an extreme. The Sabbath was introduced under Hezekiah; Abraham never lived at all; the people under Moses said their prayers to Saturn; Moses was neither captain nor lawgiver. Vatke, at any rate, is a man of great talent. Even Ewald, I regret to say, has praised Vatke highly in a review, and has scarcely noticed his errors. I foresee that in Germany, a hundred years hence, only Pantheists and believers will be opposed to each other: the deists and the old rationalists will entirely disappear. With this, thousands will be lost who now are comforted by what is at any rate a glimpse of Revelation.'

Tholuck's conversation during his visit would doubtless have made Pusey more than ever anxious to devote himself to the work of his life,—the defence and illustration of the Christian Faith. The Arabic Catalogue was now off his hands; its striking preface is dated on April 7, 1835. In it he refers to his withdrawal from further literary efforts in Arabic that he might devote himself entirely to the duties which more nearly touched upon his office, and might hope to be useful, in however small a measure, to the Church¹.

The first use which he made of his comparative leisure was to proceed with the long-deferred tract on Baptism, a project or sketch of which he had made during his illness in February, 1834. 'Pusey,' wrote Keble to Perceval in August, 1835, 'is more staunch than ever for the Church view of things; and at present especially in the matter of Baptism.' For the next three months he devoted himself especially to the study of Zwingli, who first introduced into Christendom the idea that the Sacraments are bare signs of blessings which have no real connexion with them.

'I am weary of reading,' he wrote to Newman six months later, 'in order to censure; it is a hurtful office, and my study of Zwingli, &c. in the summer was more than enough for some time.' Zwingli was, of course,

¹ 'A novo hoc labore destiti, quo me ad ea studia totum conferrem, quae officium meum propius attingerent, et

Sacrosanctae matri Ecclesiae, si fieri possit, quantulascunque utilitates afferrent.' Cat. Ar., praef. p. iv.

followed or accompanied by Calvin, who allows a virtual as distinct from an absolute value to the Sacraments, while he traverses this partial admission of truth by his fatalistic doctrine of Divine decrees which are supposed in the case of some souls summarily to nullify the effect of God's ordinances, in virtue of a prior judgment of God against them. Besides this, the Liturgies, Catholic and Reformed, claimed Pusey's attention, and a mass of American dissenting divinity, which at that time was more studied in England than would be the case at present.

As the event proved, this new direction of Pusey's studies had a material effect on the progress of the Church Movement. It is clear that at this date Newman was seriously thinking of bringing the 'Tracts for the Times' to an end. He was discouraged by the dull ignorance, as it then seemed to him, which charged Popery on the defenders of Christian antiquity. The work of editing the Tracts and of writing the greater part of them had taken up much of his time, and he wished to devote himself to some larger works.

On August 9, 1835, he writes to Hurrell Froude:—

'The Tracts are defunct or *in extremis*. Rivington has written to say they do not answer. Pusey has written one on Baptism, very good,—of ninety pages, which is to be printed at his risk. That, and one or two to finish the imperfect series (on particular subjects) will conclude the whole. I am not sorry, as I am tired of being editor!'

The Tracts were understood to appear once a month, and accordingly on St. Bartholomew's Day, August 24, Pusey published the first of his three tracts on Holy Baptism². The two following parts followed on Michaelmas Day and on St. Luke's Day as Tracts 68 and 69. These three tracts, together with an Appendix of elaborate notes, which was afterwards called No. 70, make up the second part of the second volume of the Tracts, which was issued separately, with a preface by Pusey, dated

¹ Newman's 'Letters, &c.,' ii. 124.

² Tract 67.

January 1, 1836. Thus Pusey by his own activity supplied the material for completing the issue of that year: with the commencement of 1836 other considerations, not least Pusey's advice, induced Newman to continue the publication of the Tracts.

His studies did not prevent his giving in other subjects that careful attention to details which was his characteristic. It had become necessary to reconstruct the upper part of the spire of Christ Church Cathedral, and the Dean and Chapter had decided to place at the top a finial of a somewhat simpler character than that which it replaced. The work was approaching completion, and Pusey sent a report to Dr. Bull, who was probably then, as afterwards, 'the best man of business in the Chapter,' and who was spending the summer at his vicarage of Staverton:—

'The spire has at present only the pincushion-dish on, and until the pine-apple has been placed on it I cannot much judge of the effect: whatever is done, one must expect a little criticism at first, until people's eyes are a little accustomed to it. They will soon forget that it has not been there all their lives. At present certainly it looks heavy: the horns or corners of the said dish look over-solid. But I have waited for the remainder to see what the effect would be then. Soon after you were gone I looked into the second volume of Willis, and there I found the ball and cross on the top of the two spires of Lincoln, also on the two second spires of Peterborough; the main spire which has the cock has also the ball and cross underneath. There is also a ball under what seems to be a star—the cock and vane—at Ely. Further my volume did not go, nor I, since the matter was settled. I think it would have done better, as it at all events would have had some meaning.'

Pusey was much more interested in the small livings in the patronage of the Chapter, from the greater tithes of which Christ Church drew so large a portion of its revenues. He felt strongly that they were inadequately endowed, and throughout his life lost no opportunity of bringing the subject under the notice of his colleagues.

'I commit the small livings'—he wrote to Dr. Bull—'to your care; or rather, I should say, that I recommend the living book to your

examination. For the Chapter seems very ready to attend to such cases when named ; but somehow they seem (with all due deference to one's elders) somewhat like the folk in the island of Laputa, who needed (if my memory serves me) a large fly-flapper to awaken their attention to things around them.'

Then follow business details which might suggest that Pusey was entirely absorbed in the financial condition of several livings. Another and a much less congenial subject which now occupied him was the defence of his vote for a Member of Parliament, in the Revising Barrister's Court. The votes of the Canons of Christ Church had been objected to on the ground that they were members of a corporate body, which, as such, could only act under its common seal.

'We are still here,' Pusey wrote to Bull on Sept. 20, 1835, 'and I purpose to defend my vote as I can. A Town Hall, and Revising Barristers, and Radical objections, and clamorous voters are not just the place and the society which I best like for a Canon. However, I mean to venture into it, and will bring your vote also through, if I can.'

Three days later he reports his experiences :—

'You will be interested to hear the result of this morning. I had a very long battle with a great scamp, who talked of our £2,000 a year, and seemed to wish in every way to make us as odious as he could. The Barristers determined that we had made out a strong *prima facie* case, but said that it was a very difficult one, and adjourned it to Wednesday, October 7th. I shall not be here then ; so I must leave it to you or Buckland, if he returns. I am only aware of having omitted one point, namely, our paying our separate house and window-duty, and that these vary ; whereas if our houses could in any sense be called common property, they would naturally be paid for in common, as is done with the land-tax, and, I suppose, with the house-and-window-duty of the students' rooms. They urged against me my house having been rebuilt by the Chapter after the fire. I might have set against it Barlow's rebuilding his own ; and you, I suppose, added your story at your own expense, including even the roof ; but I forgot this.

'It is allowed to be made out that we have our houses separately, but the hitch seems to be whether they are not a portion of corporate property, which we enjoy individually, and so whether they can constitute us so far a corporation sole.'

The scene seems to have been a very noisy one. One

very rough opponent asked Pusey, 'Then could you let your house to *me* if you pleased?' The answer was, 'Yes, if *I* pleased.'

Years afterwards Dr. Jeune, who became Bishop of Peterborough, used to say that one of his greatest surprises in the Hebdomadal Council had been the discovery of Pusey's talent for business. It was simply a result of the conscientious devotion to details which formed part of his conception of duty in matters both great and small. On the present occasion he failed in his immediate object. When, on the 7th of October, Dr. Bull appeared before the revisers, the names of all the Canons were struck off the list of voters, with the exception of Dr. Bull's own name, against which, by some accident, no objection had been raised.

A subject nearer to Pusey's heart, although further from his home, which greatly occupied his attention at this time, was the extension of the Church in London. To the movement which culminated in the noble effort of Bishop Blomfield, Pusey gave the original impulse by a paper which appeared in the *British Magazine* of November, 1835.

The want of churches in the suburbs of London, especially on the south of the Thames, had been pointed out by a correspondent of the Magazine six months before, and the editor added a warmly-appreciative note. But Pusey's paper, without neglecting, indeed while insisting very earnestly upon the appalling statistics of the subject, lifted it at once into the region of principle. He deprecated indeed any attempt to decide the details of a plan for new churches: this could only be done by those in authority. 'But,' he added, 'they ought to know that there are those who would gladly lay up treasure in heaven by parting with their treasure here; who would make sacrifices; who look with sickening hearts at the undisputed reign of Satan in portions of our metropolis, at the spiritual starvation of myriads, baptized into the same Body with themselves; who would gladly contribute their share, if

they were but directed.' The whole paper is worth careful perusal, glowing, as it does, with the intenser sense of heavenly things which had marked Pusey's spiritual life during the two past years. It contrasts notably with some more recent forms of advocacy of the same great cause, in that while they dwell chiefly on the spiritual destitution which they would remedy, Pusey is as much, if not more, concerned for the apathy and unfaithfulness of Christians who can permit it. One passage of the paper may well here be quoted; it was referred to more than once, and with admiration, by the late Dean Stanley. Pusey had been saying that great harm had been done by abandoning the term 'voluntary' to those outside the Church. He continues:—

'We are in much danger of forgetting that we are the "voluntary Church": that our cathedrals, our churches, our chapels were raised by the sacrifices, in some cases enormous sacrifices, of individuals,—in others, by bodies of men; but in almost all by the voluntary exertions of individuals, whether singly or united,—not by the State.'

After referring to Antony à Wood's well-known contrast between the magnificence of ecclesiastical fabrics in medieval Oxford and the comparative meanness of those which remained in his own day, Pusey continues:—

'It is humiliating to gaze at one of the least of the noble fabrics which they [our ancestors] raised to their Maker's praise, and to ask, Where are the descendants of such an ancestry? Where is the Lord God of Elijah?

'Their spirit is fled: we have come to the dregs of time; or (on authority which men of this day will trust) "to the declining age of our State"; at least, those things are flourishing among us which Bacon marked as the symptoms of its declining age; and we make our boast of that which is our shame. "Grey hairs are here and there upon him, yet he knoweth not" (Hos. vii. 9). Our old towns and cities are recognized from far by their towers and spires, hallowing all the landscape,—a continual memorial of things unseen, infusing holy thoughts which ascend directly to their Author, and reminding us that we are everywhere standing on God's earth, on a Christian land, on "holy ground." And who shall calculate the power of their often-renewed influence upon his own mind? Who can tell how many holy resolves, and pure thoughts, and earnest aspirations to the heavens

whither they ascend, he has not owed to them, and, consequently, how much of his future glory? And then, calculate the tens of thousands, in each generation since they were raised, who have felt the like, or "count the stars of heaven"! And what do we? Our modern towns have their characteristics,—the chimneys of our manufactories, and the smoke of our furnaces. And we "boast ourselves in the multitude of our riches," and our wisdom, and our enlightening, and our skill in the mechanical arts, and our knowledge in physical sciences, and the Bibles which we print: while the only true wisdom we have not known.'

This paper is dated Oxford, September, 1835, and must have been written concurrently with the second part of his tract on Baptism. The editor followed it up by statements respecting the spiritual desolation of Brighton and other large towns; and Pusey contributed at least some particulars.

Meanwhile others were stirring:—

'Rose writes me word,'—so Pusey tells Newman in January. 1836, —'that the Evangelical (so-called) party have offered to the Bishop of London to raise £150,000, if he will lead a Diocesan Society like that at Chester, to build churches by the means of trustees, who are to have the patronage and throw all the force thus acquired into the Puritan scale. It seems then that if this great work is ever to be done upon a Church plan, and not so as to augment the evils of our Church, it must be done now. Rose thinks we cannot stir without the Bishop, and that he will not refuse the Evangelical offer.'

The Bishop, however, took an independent line of his own; and the plan known as the Metropolis Churches Fund was formed early in 1836. As soon as the plan was sufficiently matured, the Bishop himself sent it in manuscript to Pusey, 'for the purpose'—as he states—'of ascertaining whether it will meet your views¹.'

The question of the patronage of the proposed new churches was discussed in several letters. Pusey was for placing it altogether in the hands of the Bishop. The Bishop, in this agreeing with Mr. Joshua Watson, thought that the principle of private trusteeship must be admitted with certain restrictions—at least, at first. The corre-

¹ Bishop of London to Rev. E. B. Pusey, April 4, 1836.

spondence was interrupted for a time by the Bishop's illness in May, 1836: it was resumed in view of the proposed meeting on June 7th, when the plan took a definite shape. At this meeting Pusey was present: he became a member of the Committee.

Pusey was delighted with the Bishop's cordiality, but their intercourse was not unenlivened by differences of opinion. Later in the year 1836 Pusey proposed to the Bishop that the endowments of the new churches should be secured to them on condition of there being no changes in the Prayer-book, or only such as might 'bring it even nearer to the standard of Christian antiquity.' The Bishop dismissed this suggestion somewhat abruptly. He would not place all these new churches on a different footing from the old ones now existing. An improbable and remote danger would not warrant him in making openly a provision for schism. If the people at large and the great body of the clergy were in favour of liturgical change they would overrule any such conditions as Pusey proposed. There was an inconsistency too in a proposal which went on the principle of disallowing any changes in the Prayer-book, while making an exception in one direction welcome to the author and his friends. And all speculations on such a subject as the alteration of the Prayer-book were to be discouraged. They shook confidence in the stability of the Church of England: they tended to widen differences which a common danger might compose.

Pusey, of course, had to give way; and the difference did not in the least affect the cordial relations which existed at this time between him and the Bishop of London. The latter was deeply convinced of Pusey's earnestness of purpose. 'I have not said,' the Bishop writes to Pusey, 'as much as I ought in acknowledging your own munificent donation.' This donation was £5,000, in two instalments; it was given, as were all his larger gifts, anonymously¹, but the Bishop obviously knew who

¹ One was as 'from a clergyman seeking treasure in heaven.'

the donor in this instance was. In order to make such an offering to God's service Pusey was obliged to reduce his servants, to give up his carriage, and to live even more simply than heretofore.

Some years after, when Pusey was called upon to give evidence in Court in a case of alleged lunacy, he was asked in cross-examination whether a person who gave away very large sums of money to religious objects could be considered capable of managing his property. He gravely answered that he could be so considered¹.

Pusey's latest service to the Bishop's great scheme was the republication of his first paper in the *British Magazine*, together with another that appeared in November 1836 in answer to objections urged by the *Record* and other critics. He also persuaded Newman to print the now well-known and striking sermon, 'Make ventures for Christ's sake.' The preface is Pusey's; and he too suggested the motto from St. Augustine, in which Christ says to the Christian, '*Est alius locus quo te transferam: praecedat te quod habes: noli timere ne perdas: dator ego eram; custos ego ero.*'

In September, Pusey, thoroughly tired out with work, went to Brighton. There he remained throughout October. On one occasion at the least he seems to have preached for the Rev. Henry Venn Elliott at St. Mary's: his subject was, 'What has been done for us and in us.' He was also engaged on the third part of his tract on Baptism. It would be more likely to come out, he humorously writes to Harrison, now that he was removed from libraries. But Harrison helped him in looking out references at the Bodleian; and in return was the receiver of two letters which show the method of his work. The first letter if quoted would not add much to the knowledge of modern liturgical students; but it shows the steps and motives to which it is due that our present higher knowledge has been reached. In the second letter Pusey gives the

¹ There is an allusion to this incident in the striking sermon 'Our Pharisaism,' Lenten Sermons, Oxford, 1874, p. 156.

following reasons for the continuance of the Tracts, and sees further work for them in the future.

‘I should be sorry that the Tracts should be given up, and it happens remarkably enough that just the months to the end of the year which seemed likely to stand unoccupied promise to be filled up by numbers of my tract, which I once thought that I should have finished by August, and the Tracts must be carried on beyond the time when they were to be concluded and would have been regularly. I expect to print towards 100 more pages (to conclude the tract) for November, and the extra notes, although not of this magnitude, may very likely occupy some 40 or 50 more; which will do for December. Just tell Newman this and what Bowden says. But I am not so sure about what B. says of carrying on the two series, for I know not that the Popish controversy may not just be the best way of handling Ultra-Protestantism: i.e. neglecting it, not advancing against, but setting Catholic views against Roman Catholicism and so disposing of Ultra-Protestantism by a side-wind, and teaching people Catholicism, without their suspecting, while they are only bent on demolishing Romanism. I suspect we might thus have people with us, instead of against us, and that they might find themselves Catholics before they were aware: for thus the Catholic statements would be purely historical (as brought from the Fathers), the polemics would be against Rome. Only instead of the Ultra-Protestant fashion of saying “the Fathers spoke warmly or hyperbolically,” &c., without troubling themselves to know what the Fathers did say, the passages of the Fathers would be produced in real earnest and speak for themselves.

‘Only, for myself, . . . I have been thrown much behindhand in everything, by having employed this Vacation on the tract—not but that I am glad that I have been so led on (since I was *led on*), but that I have no time left. . . .

‘I expect to return on Saturday, October 31, so if you do not hear from me again, pray give notice for my lectures in the Psalms in the usual way on *Mondays*, Tuesdays, Thursdays, and Saturdays at *one*: (they would send you an old notice from the Press). My lectures to begin November 3 and to see persons on Monday. Yours and Pauli’s when you think best.’

On his return to Oxford Pusey carried out a plan which had been in contemplation for some time,—the foundation of the Theological Society.

The objects of this Society were threefold. It was intended first of all to promote ‘knowledge of the several branches of theology, and to further full, clear, and definite views by reference to original sources.’ For this, Oxford

afforded 'very singular opportunities.' But, secondly, theological study was to be promoted 'according to the peculiar character of our Church, by combining the study of Christian antiquity with that of Holy Scripture.' Thirdly, the society was not to be confined to older men or experts. It was to 'afford to students facilities of hearing subjects discussed, or difficult texts of Scripture explained fully and in detail.'

These objects might seem to be none other than those which the Faculty of Theology itself would naturally and always have kept in view. But the official profession of a great subject is not always accompanied by the specific enthusiasm which would do the best that could be done for it; and theological knowledge is apt to stagnate unless it be committed to the keeping of an earnest religious conviction. The new Society, however, anxiously endeavoured to recognize the rights as well as the duties of the Oxford Professoriate. Everything relating to the Society was to be regulated by a committee. This committee would make bye-laws as well as direct the conduct of meetings. It was to consist of the two Professors of Divinity¹, the Regius Professor of Hebrew, the Archdeacon of Oxford, and three other members, whose places were to be filled up by the whole body when the first vacancies occurred. Thus, by the constitution of the society, a majority of its governing body consisted of persons in high office at Oxford². But it does not appear that this provision had any practical effect³. The first committee seems to have consisted of five members only: the Regius

¹ These would be the Regius and the Margaret Professors of Divinity. The Regius Chairs of Pastoral Theology and Ecclesiastical History date only from 1842.

² It is observable that the Rev. W. Palmer, although an active and well-informed theologian, of whom Newman speaks respectfully, was not a member of the society. He 'attended one meeting and felt by no means satisfied of the wisdom and expediency

of the design.' May there not have been an explanation of this other than that the design was unwise or inexpedient? Cf. 'Narrative,' p. 133.

³ Dr. Burton, the Regius Professor of Divinity, died almost immediately after the foundation of the society, and his successor, Dr. Hampden, could not have been expected to act with it. Nor does it appear that the Margaret Professor of Divinity, Dr. Faussett, ever took his place on the committee.

Professor of Hebrew, the Archdeacon of Oxford (Dr. Clerke), the Rev. John Keble, the Rev. J. H. Newman, the Rev. F. Oakeley.

It has sometimes been the fashion to attempt to promote theology by desultory talk at breakfasts or dinners. The new Society proposed to go to work by reading papers; but precautions were taken that these papers should be of a high order of excellence. The fifth rule of the Society provided that 'in order to prevent the possibility of unadvised and random observations upon sacred subjects,' no discussion on the subject of any paper should take place at the meeting of the Society during which the paper was read. No one could read a paper who was not in holy orders and of sufficient standing to preach before the University. The committee might ban any subject the discussion of which they deemed inexpedient; and no subject could be handled without their approval. Every essay that was read must have been recommended by one member of the committee; and the committee was to determine the order in which papers should be read.

The ten rules of the Society were composed and proposed by Pusey, and accepted by the others with little or no modification: the committee then proceeded to enact its bye-laws. Any B. A. was eligible for membership in the Society; and any member might introduce friends, not being undergraduates, to its meetings. Papers were to be read on every Friday in Michaelmas and Lent Terms, and on every second Friday in Easter and Act Term. The substance of each paper was to be briefly summarized at the subsequent meeting, with a view to further discussion when there had been an interval for thought and reading.

There can be no question of the influence of this Society on the Oxford movement. It stimulated theological thought and work more than any other agency in Oxford at the time; it gave a point to study, and prevented desultoriness and a one-sided interest in the controversies of the day. Above all, it fed both the *British Magazine* and the 'Tracts

for the Times,' especially the latter, with a series of essays upon subjects of which little was known or thought in those days. It enabled the editor of the Tracts to carry out the change of plan, adopted in the latter part of the second volume, by which 'tracts of considerable extent of subject were substituted for the short and incomplete papers with which the publication commenced¹.' Mr. Keble appears to have read no less than eight papers before the Society, on 'The Mysticism attributed to the Early Fathers,' but only a fragment of this considerable labour was given to the world in the eighty-ninth tract. The Rev. I. Williams' tract on 'Reserve in communicating Religious Knowledge' grew out of two papers read before the Society. Others which did not appear in the Tracts were those in which Newman discussed 'The Apollinarians and the Monophysites'; Charles Marriott, 'The relation of Church and State as it appears in the History of Theodoret'; and Mr. B. Harrison, 'The School of Alexandria.' Pusey himself, besides the inaugural paper, seems to have given an 'Historical Account of the Doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice in the Anglican Church, as occurring in the several forms of her Liturgy²,' which formed the early part of the eighty-first tract; and an 'Historical View of the Pelagian Heresy,' in two papers³, which do not appear to have been made further use of, at least in this form.

One rule of the Society was that

'a book be kept wherein subjects upon which any member will undertake to write, or upon which he wishes to see an essay written, may be entered: so likewise texts of Holy Scripture which he wishes to have explained or will explain.'

This book happily survives, and it shows how large was the range of theological interests in the members of the Society⁴.

The first meeting of the Society was held on Nov. 12,

¹ 'Tracts for the Times,' vol. iii. Advertisement.

² April 28, 1837.

³ March 27 and May 15, 1840.

⁴ See Appendix to this chapter.

1835. On the previous day Pusey wrote to Mrs. Pusey, who was staying at Ryde in the Isle of Wight :—

‘ Our little, or large, Theological Society is to meet on alternate Fridays, as you wished, at 8 after to-morrow. There will be only two more meetings this Term ; Friday week, and three weeks. It promises well, but I almost fear I see elements of disunion, in that John [Newman] will scare people. But of this nothing now. It is for the present held in this house ; so I shall be Moderator, and all your chairs confiscated.’

On the day after the meeting he writes :—

‘ Last night I read a paper which N. says must have lasted an hour and twenty minutes, and my chest was not at all tired. There were thirty persons present in the dining-room, so I had to read from one end to the other. I do not know how it went off. I was a little nervous about it, which I was not in the University pulpit. One ought not to have thought of self more here than there.’

In his inaugural address Pusey evidently endeavoured to set the tone of the proceedings of the Society. His subject was, ‘ The necessity of Theological Learning, especially in the Church of England.’ This necessity he based on the double character of the English Church as Catholic and yet Reformed. If a Reformed Church must be a student of Scripture, a Catholic Church must add to the study of Scripture that of ecclesiastical antiquity. Pusey deprecated the one-sidedness which would sacrifice Scripture to antiquity or antiquity to a mistaken conception of the best methods for studying Scripture ; and the latter being the danger of the time, the paper is mainly taken up with arguing the importance of the study of antiquity. The argument is emphatically an Anglican argument : the 6th Article is discussed in order to show that if Scripture contains all necessary truth its use is not so much to teach as to ‘ prove ’ what is taught by the teaching Church ; and the 20th, that if the Church may not expound one place in Scripture that it be contrary to another, this limitation implies that the Church is the expounder as well as the keeper and witness of Scripture. A large part of the paper is devoted to establishing the value of antiquity from

the language of Bishop Jewel when in controversy with Harding, although, as was natural, Hammond and other Caroline divines are also laid under contribution. The paper lays stress on the advantages of the Reformation, and speaks of the Lutheran and Reformed 'Churches.'

As time went on Pusey became exceedingly hopeful about the Society. The meetings were attended by many young men of promise; some of their names were not in later years associated with the Movement. In the MS. lists of attendances we read Cureton, Liddell, Golightly, C. Williams, Robert Hussey, P. C. Claughton, H. Kynaston. One accomplished young man, who combined with the study of Medicine that of Hebrew and Arabic, Mr. W. A. Greenhill, of Trinity College, describes his experience:—

'The meeting was in the large study of later years, at that time the dining-room. Dr. Pusey sat at the head of the table, on the west side of the room. Newman sat on his right, and read the paper, the subject of which was the Apollinarian Heresy¹. There was little or rather no discussion. People appeared to be afraid to venture on a topic of which they knew little². As a young man, I thought it dry.'

Meanwhile, the existence of periodical meetings at a private house in Oxford, not having for their object hospitality or amusement, attracted attention. There are always a certain number of people who look with a jaundiced eye upon any form of doing good in which they themselves have no share. It was urged that the Theological Society 'was acephalous and irresponsible.' One 'knew not what might come of it.' Nothing should be done without the Bishop; but what had the Bishop had to do with the Theological Society? To this last objection it was sufficient to reply that the Christian Church had always recognized an independence, within limits, in her schools of theology; that Universities had been founded after this principle; and that the objection would tell against the Theological Faculty at Oxford. The other criticism

¹ This fixes the date as Nov. 3, 1837.

² All discussion was by the rules reserved for the following meeting.

could only be refuted by the event; but, in truth, it was too much the language of prejudice to wait for serious discussion.

Connected with this plan was another, having in view the same object—a revived interest in and study of theology. Pusey proposed to take into his house three or four Bachelors of Arts; to keep them at his own expense; and to afford them assistance in reading. The first to avail himself of this generous project was Mr. J. B. Mozley. He was a striking illustration of the theory that the finest minds generally ripen late. He had graduated as a third classman, and had since been rejected twice when standing for a Fellowship at Oriel. Pusey's offer came to him when he was eager to study, yet without any means of maintaining himself as a student in Oxford, and he eagerly accepted it. His account of the plan is given in a letter to his mother:—

‘Pusey, the Canon, finding his house too large for him, and thinking also that his house and income were never intended by the original benefactors of the Church to be used only for private convenience, is going to take in three or four men, to give each of them apartments, and also the free use of his library. In return for this they are to read,—divinity I suppose, or subjects connected with it; following at the same time the bent of their own minds as to the particular course of reading, and only referring to Pusey when they think they want advice and assistance. This is a liberal plan. Pusey, in short, only claims to give men an excuse and object for staying up after their degree: he wishes above everything to encourage the study of theology, as one great way of pouring in some light upon this ignorant age; ignorant, that is, as to all sacred learning and primitive views. I cannot give the exact details of the scheme, or how we are to live together, and what we are to see of Pusey, and of each other; but there is the general arrangement¹.’

To be suddenly introduced to the innermost circle of a family, with a certain strictness and severity of life, and with some marked peculiarities of character; and this upon no such well-defined footing as that either of a visitor or a private tutor, was not without an element of difficulty

¹ ‘Letters of J. B. Mozley, D.D.,’ p. 57. ‘To his Mother,’ dated April 10, 1836.

a young man. But, however this may have been, it was easily surmounted, partly no doubt by Mozley's good sense, and still more through Pusey's tact and perfect consideration for others. 'I am writing,' Mozley tells his mother six weeks afterwards, 'in Dr. Pusey's dining-room. I really flatter myself I get on very well with the Puseys; which is something to say, considering the strangeness of the situation.' In Michaelmas Term he was joined by Mr. Ashworth of Brasenose, and Mr. Phillips of All Souls, who came at the instance of Newman. With these was associated Mr. F. M. R. Barker of Oriel College—a relative of Mrs. Pusey. The arrangement seems to have lasted until the summer of 1838, when the plan took a new form. Mrs. Pusey's health had then become too critical to admit of her receiving as inmates persons who were not members of the family. But Newman was now anxious that the work of encouraging and supervising the work of young men should not drop, and he accordingly took a house for the purpose in St. Aldate's. Another feature of change was that inmates of the house were not to be students reading on their own account, but assistants and fellow-workers of Pusey's in the 'Library of the Fathers' and his other literary undertakings. It was described as a 'reading and writing establishment' ¹ by J. B. Mozley's friendly pen. Newman seems to have been at the head of it; and one of his companions was Mr. Mark Pattison, who, while there, dictated some MSS. of St. Cyprian, and translated the *Epistola Aurea* on St. Matthew ². But in this second stage of the project does not appear to have been a success. To become intimate with Pusey and Newman in 1838 made young men objects of suspicion; and Pusey's home sorrows in 1839 may have for the time made his supervision less effective than it would otherwise have been. The home seems to have been closed in 1840, when J. B. Mozley, who since the preceding November had been its only inmate, was elected a Fellow of Magdalen ³.

¹ Letters of J. B. Mozley, D.D., p. 78.

² 'Memoirs of M. Pattison, p. 180.

³ 'Letters of J. B. Mozley, D.D., p. 94.

APPENDIX TO CHAPTER XIV.

THE THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

*Subjects, Passages of Scripture, &c., proposed for dissertation
or exposition.*

Undertaken

- by* 1. God was by the death of His Son reconciled to us,
not we to Him only.
- E. B. P. 2. γλώσσαις λαλεῖν, extent and character of this gift:
whether a mere external gift? not a mere utterance
of deep religious truth in language beyond the ca-
pacity of ordinary Christians, as Neander, &c. main-
tain. Account of the Fathers.
3. Of whom is St. Paul speaking Rom. vii? Origin of
the views of Augustine and other Fathers.
4. What did the Fathers understand by προσφορά, θυσία,
as applied to the Lord's Supper?
5. Doctrine of the Fathers with regard to Christ's presence
in the Eucharist.
6. 'Communion of Saints': doctrine explained historically.
- E. B. P. 7. 'Zohar,' age of? Agreement with Christian doctrine.
- E. B. P. 8. Fiction of two Messiahs, Ben Joseph and Ben David.
Age, character, and providential use of.
- E. B. P. 9. Symbolical actions of the Prophets: whether actually
performed, or a mode of parabolic teaching only,
or each.
- E. B. P. 10. Symbolical language of Prophecy: is its physical or
its spiritual meaning the true one? How did the
early Christians understand it?
11. οἱ βαπτιζόμενοι ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν. 1 Cor. xv. 29.
12. View of the early Church with regard to the Ministry
of Angels in combination with St. Matt. xviii. 10.
- B. H. 13. The Church in the Post-Apostolic age (Epistles of
Ignatius, &c.): its system traced in the New Testament
and in the Jewish temple.
- [No. 14 has been omitted.]
15. Sketch of the Missions in the Middle Ages.
16. Anselm and his times.
17. St. Bernard against Abeldard.

Undertaken

- by* 18. Traditions of the Eastern Church.
 19. Defects of early Protestant opponents of the Church of Rome.
 20. Mystical theology of Church of Rome.
 21. Influence of Zwingli upon the Reformed portion of the Protestant Church.
- Promised. 22. Position of the Church in James' time with reference to Christendom.
- Promised. 23. State of the Western Church just before the Council of Trent.
- Promised. 24. Correspondence between the history of the Arian heresy with that of the Papal apostasy.
- Promised. 25. Cranmer's negotiations for a union of the Reformed Churches, illustrating some of our Articles and Formularies.
- Promised. 26. Succession of Schools of Theology in the Western Church from St. Athanasius' banishment to the present time.
27. Doctrine of Inspiration as held by the ancient Fathers, and the influence of their views as respects the Apocrypha. [Erased.]
- Promised. 28. The use of the word *τελειος* in the Epistle to the Hebrews.
- Promised. 29. The serpent in the wilderness, as employed by our Saviour in St. John iii.
- Promised. 30. Forensic justification, the doctrine of first five chapters of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans.
31. On the Rule of Faith. (Read on Friday, November 20, [1836], by the Rev. J. H. Newman.)
- Promised. 32. Inquiry into the best line of argument for meeting the Romanists.
33. On a peculiar species of Rationalism existing at the present day. (Read on Friday by the Rev. J. H. Newman.)
34. History of the rise of the Benedictines.
- Promised. 35. On Laud's view of the Articles.
- Promised. 36. On the principle and history of doctrinal developments in the Church.
- Promised. 37. Proofs of Infant Baptism.
38. Rise and progress of Jansenism. (Read on Friday by the Rev. F. Oakeley.)
39. Mediate Inspiration of the Apocrypha, as held by the Antients and Anglican Church, as distinct from the modern Church of Rome or Protestant bodies. (Read on four successive Fridays in Easter and Act Terms by the Rev. E. B. Pusey, D.D.)

Undertaken

- by 40. History and character of the Non-jurors. (Read on two successive Fridays by the Rev. W. J. Copeland, Trinity College.)
41. (Read by the Rev. John Keble.)
42. On the Epistle of St. Barnabas. (Read by the Rev. B. Harrison.)
43. The argument for the Apostolical appointment of Episcopacy as drawn by Hooker from the general consent of Catholic antiquity, compared with the testimony of Clement's Epistle.
44. The testimony of the Latin Church to 1 St. John v. 7.

CHAPTER XV.

THE TRACT ON BAPTISM—CONTINUANCE AND EDITORSHIP OF THE 'TRACTS FOR THE TIMES' IN DOUBT.

1835.

PUSEY'S tract on Baptism was unquestionably the work in virtue of which he took his place among the leaders of the Oxford Movement. Its appearance marked an epoch, both in the history of his own religious mind and in the progress of the cause to which it contributed.

It has indeed been a matter of curious speculation how a man who began life as a scholar, and who throughout his career, both by mental temperament and the discipline of a long occupation, was eminently a scholar, should have entered upon a subject which, although demanding the interpretation of sacred language, belongs, in part, if not largely, to religious philosophy. As a rule the philological and the philosophical or theological temper exclude each other. Philology has a place of the highest honour in the service of religion as an interpreter of the sacred records; but they who have most excelled in explaining the language which enshrines Divine Truth have rarely attained the highest excellence as interpreters of the Truth which that language enshrines. The contrast between the schools of Antioch and Alexandria in the ancient Church represents a constant fact of the human mind.

Pusey was led to make the reality and value of sacramental grace a main interest of his life by his vivid sense of the peculiar dangers to which, fifty years ago, religion was exposed. He explains his motive in the preface which appeared with the first edition of his tract on Baptism.

'Rationalism'—he uses the term in a very general sense—had changed, not its animus against Christianity, but its method of working. The open attacks of the Deists had been defeated. The conquered enemy now appeared as the ally and supporter of the faith which he would fain undermine. · Rationalism

'supports our evidences ; reconciles our difficulties ; smooths down the "hard sayings" of the Word of God ; and steals away our treasure. The Blessed Sacraments are a peculiar obstacle to its inroads, for their effects come directly from God, and their mode of operation is as little cognisable to reason as their Author: they flow to us from an unseen world. What we see has as little power to heal or strengthen our souls as the clay and the spittle to give sight to the blind man or the waters of Jordan to cleanse the leper: those who use them in faith have life and strength ; yet it is not their faith alone which gives this life, any more than faith would have cleansed Naaman, but for Him Who gave the Jordan power to make his "flesh as a little child." The Blessed Sacraments then are a daily testimony to our faith: we are strengthened, we hold onwards: *how* we obtain our strength we can give to reason no account: suffice that we know *whence* it cometh. This then has become a main point of attack¹.'

Thus it was that the governing motive of Pusey's active life, zeal for the defence of Revealed Religion, which had inspired him as a young man in his correspondence with Z., and as a student in Germany when studying the philological and literary sources of scepticism, was that which led him to lay such stress upon sacramental grace. The Bible was an ancient literature; and men were enabled at once to speak respectfully of it and to disbelieve it, by dwelling on its antiquity or on its relations to the men and thoughts of other times. But the Sacraments are with us now ; each time that they are administered they challenge a verdict as to their precise worth and power ; and thus it is that unbelief, which could mask its real attitude towards an inspired but ancient literature, is obliged to display itself when dealing with them. They force its hand ; they test faith directly and importunately, as did our Lord when as Man, visibly present among men.

¹ 'Scriptural Views of Holy Baptism,' pref. p. ix.

He yet claimed to be, and to be acknowledged as, One with the Father.

Newman, as editor of the 'Tracts for the Times,' points out the importance of the tract on Baptism from this point of view.

'There are those,' he says, "'whose word will eat as doth a canker"; and it is to be feared that we have been over-near certain celebrated Protestant teachers, Puritan or Latitudinarian, and have suffered in consequence. Hence we have almost embraced the doctrine that God conveys grace only through the instrumentality of the mental energies, that is, through faith, prayer, active spiritual contemplation, or (what is commonly called) communion with God, in contradiction to the primitive view according to which the Church and her Sacraments are the ordained and direct visible means of conveying to the soul what is in itself supernatural and unseen.'

This general deficiency in the religion of the day is, Newman observes, met by the tract on Baptism; which

'is to be regarded not as an enquiry into one single or isolated doctrine, but as a delineation and serious examination of a modern system of theology of extensive popularity and great speciousness, in its elementary and characteristic principles¹.'

From an entirely opposite point of view, the Rev. F. D. Maurice said of Pusey's tracts on Baptism that

'their publication and importance in relation to the Movement justified the statement made by Dr. Newman in his "Apologia," that Dr. Pusey's joining him and his friends had given to what had been beforehand a mere gathering together of sympathizers weight and authority².'

To this it must be added that the immediate motive for throwing the tract into its actual shape was a personal one.

'A pupil of mine,' Pusey said forty-five years later, 'was on the verge of leaving the Church for Dissent, and on the ground that the Church taught Baptismal Regeneration in the Prayer-book. So I set myself to show what the teaching of Scripture about Holy Baptism was. My tract was called "*Scriptural Views of Holy Baptism*." By *Views* I did not mean doctrines, but only such aspects as Baptism would present to any one who looks at Holy Scripture.'

¹ 'Tracts for the Times,' vol. ii. pref. pp. v, vi.

² 'Life of F. D. Maurice,' i. 214.

The keynote of the subject then is struck in the title, 'Scriptural Views of Holy Baptism¹.' The object of the writer is to show that the teaching of Scripture on the point is plain enough; that 'difficulties raised against Baptismal Regeneration seem to lie entirely in . . . collateral questions, not in the defect of Scripture evidence for its truth.' Accordingly Pusey begins by insisting at length that the evidence for the doctrine must be considered without reference to its supposed influence, or the supposed religious character of those who held it at a given time. Understanding regeneration to mean 'the act by which God takes us out of our relation to Adam and makes us actual members of His Son,' Pusey goes on to show that whereas regeneration is connected in Scripture with baptism, there is nothing in Scripture to sever it from baptism. For the proof of this statement we must refer our readers to the tract itself, which even after fifty intervening years of controversy on this sacred subject is still well worth reading. That which must strike an unprejudiced reader is Pusey's anxiety to arrive at the inmost meaning of Scripture; his anxious attention to its passing hints and its indirect teaching. But the doctrine is directly grounded by him first on the explicit words of our Lord, and then of St. Paul, combined with the words in which the Sacrament was instituted, and St. Peter's assertion that it is a present means of salvation. Then follows a review of passages in which Holy Scripture speaks of gifts of God, while modern writers often see only duties of man, or to which modern writers appeal when appropriating to themselves the privileges of baptism, without thinking of the means by which they are conveyed. Not the least striking parts of the tract are the discussions of the incidental mention of baptism in Holy Scripture, and the indications of its importance as inferred from the language of Scripture about it when conferred on individuals,

¹ This is the title in the first edition. In the second edition are added the words 'as established by the consent

of the ancient Church, and contrasted with the systems of modern schools.'

and the baptism of our Lord Himself, as sanctifying water. The types are discussed last: they illustrate to a believer the place assigned to the doctrine by Holy Scripture; they do not by themselves prove it.

It may be well to add a vivid passage, characteristic of Pusey in its cumulative intensity, and intended to press closely upon the consciences of earnest but mistaken opponents of the Revealed Doctrine how sharply the language of Scripture contrasts with popular rejections of the doctrine of baptismal grace :—

‘The plain letter of Scripture says, “We are saved by baptism,” and men say, “We are not saved by baptism”: our Lord says, “A man must be born of water and the Spirit”; man, that he need *not*, *cannot* be born of water: Scripture, that “we are saved by the washing of regeneration”; man, that we are not, but by regeneration which is *as* a washing: Scripture, that “we are baptized for the remission of sins”; man, that we are not, but to attest that remission: Scripture, that “whosoever hath been baptized into Christ hath put on Christ”; man, that he hath *not*: Scripture, that they have been buried with Him by baptism into death; man, that they have *not*: Scripture, that “Christ cleansed the Church by the washing of water by the word”; man, that He did *not*, for bare elements *could* have no such virtue: Scripture, that we were baptized into one body; men, that we were *not*, but that we were in that body before. Surely they have entered into a most perilous path, which, unless they are checked in pursuing it, must end in the rejection of all Scripture truth which does not square with their own previous opinions. It did once so end; and it is a wholesome, but awful warning, for those who will be warned, that it was out of the school of Calvin, from familiar intercourse with him, and the so-called “Reformed” Church,—that it was out of and through the Reformed Doctrine,—that Socinianism took its rise¹.’

This last sentence points to a conviction which was one of the motive powers of the revival, namely, that principles of interpretation, like arguments, must be applied consistently. This necessity was forced on Pusey’s mind by contact with the thought and literature of Germany; on Newman’s by a logical habit of thinking which was a leading characteristic of his rare originality.

¹ Tract 69, 1st ed., p. 198.

It had been possible for some divines of an earlier age to write of the Person and work of Christ almost in the language of St. Athanasius and St. Cyril, while they discussed the Sacraments in the tone of Calvin and Zwingli. But this inconsistency was becoming less and less practicable when the operation of theological principles, whether conservative or destructive, was more clearly apprehended, both from internal analysis and in the light of history. It was clear to Pusey that if the solvents which were applied by Zwingli to those great texts of Scripture which teach sacramental grace were also applied to those other texts which teach the Divinity and Atonement of our Lord, the result would be Socinianism; while, if the Baptismal and Eucharistic language of the New Testament was understood in the literal and reverent sense in which serious Christians read the texts that illustrate our Lord's Godhead and His Sacrifice for the sins of the world, the Zwinglian and even the Calvinistic theories of the Sacraments would be no longer possible. The popular Protestantism was really, if unconsciously, on an inclined plane; and if attachment to such positive truth as it still held did not lead it to ascend to a point where all would be safe because consistent, it would, at no distant time, be forced downwards by the irreligious criticism of the day into an abyss where any faith would be impossible.

In Pusey's mind, therefore, the battle for sacramental grace was a battle for continued belief in the revelation of God in Christ. Pusey will not allow that baptismal regeneration or any other Christian truth is to be judged of by its supposed influence upon men's hearts and characters. To do this, he says, 'would imply that we know much more of our own nature and what is necessary or conducive to its restoration than we do.' If a good life always meant a true creed, many mutually contradictory errors would be true. If a bad life always meant a false creed, there would be no such thing as holding the truth in unrighteousness. But fifty years ago it was common for

people to speak of the doctrine of baptismal regeneration as 'deadening' and 'soul destroying.' Such language, if sincere, was, Pusey contends, the fruit of a very narrow experience. If, in days of religious apathy, people had lulled their consciences to sleep with the notion that having by baptism been made children of God they had nothing further to do, it did not follow that this notion was itself a true inference from the doctrine, or that it would be entertained in days of greater religious earnestness and intelligence. Of course, if baptism was only an outward form, unaccompanied by any certain gift of grace, to rest in it was indeed a fatal delusion: but then this was not the Scriptural account of baptism. If baptism was the instrument by which the grace of regeneration was conveyed to the soul, this grace was conferred upon conditions: it might be forfeited by disloyalty to known truth and duty. The sense of possessing a priceless gift, which made obedience to the Divine Will possible and welcome, while the gift itself might be easily parted with, so far from being 'deadening' would prove to most men a very powerful moral stimulus.

In a rugged but fine passage Pusey states his sense of the greatness of the doctrine of baptismal regeneration when held positively:—

'Baptismal regeneration, as connected with the Incarnation of our Blessed Lord, gives a depth to our Christian existence, an actualness to our union with Christ, a reality to our sonship to God, an interest in the presence of our Lord's glorified Body at God's right hand, a joyousness amid the subduing of the flesh, an overwhelmingness to the dignity conferred on human nature, a solemnity to the communion of saints who are the fullness of Him Who filleth all in all, a substantiality to the indwelling of Christ, that to those who retain this truth the school which abandoned it must needs appear to have sold its birthright. But it is one thing to hold baptismal regeneration, and another to hold merely that there is no regeneration subsequent to baptism. A mere negative view must always be a cold one¹.'

The tract on Baptism at once, as has been said, placed Pusey before the world as a leader of the Oxford Move-

¹ Tract 67, p. 12, 3rd edition.

ment, and, while it commanded wide sympathy and acquiescence, it also occasioned some characteristic expressions of hostile opinion. The Rev. F. D. Maurice had written in favour of maintaining the existing system of subscription at Oxford, and this had led to the idea that he was in some degree of sympathy with the Oxford High Churchmen. It is probable that he himself thought so, so long as the issues were vaguely defined; but the tract on Baptism was too much for a mind which throughout its career was before all things eclectic and self-reliant. We are told that Mr. Maurice

‘often spoke of his having taken Dr. Pusey’s tract with him on a walk’—to attend one of the meetings of the ‘Clapham Sect,’—‘and how, as he went along, it became more and more clear to him that the tract represented everything that he did not think and did not believe, till at last he sat down on a gate, in what were then the open fields of Clapham, and made up his mind that it represented the parting-point between him and the Oxford School. He always spoke of it with a kind of shudder, as it were of an escape from a charmed dungeon’¹.

It appears that Mr. Maurice’s objections to the tract were various if not incompatible. The tract, he said, ‘undermined’ the doctrine of Luther which Bishop Bull had ‘resisted,’ that simple belief in Christ is the deliverance from evil and the root of good. It ‘scattered’ Maurice’s ‘dream’ that regeneration was something independent of ‘the individual faith of men.’ It taught that baptismal regeneration meant a change of nature, produced by union with the new humanity of the Son of God, while Mr. Maurice believed that it meant no more than bringing into light a relation to God which had always existed. If the teaching of the tract were true, said Mr. Maurice, ‘he himself might as well leave off preaching, for he could have no message to declare to men from God.’

An estimable clergyman of a small church in the north of England, and of very puritanical opinions, wrote to Pusey:—

‘On Wednesday last I learned from the *Record* that you had given

¹ ‘Life of F. D. Maurice,’ i. p. 186.

great publicity in Oxford to the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, and on the evening of Thursday I warned my congregation from the pulpit that from one of the most learned Universities in Europe is emanating one of the most dangerous heresies that can disturb the Christian Church.'

Pusey suggested to his correspondent that he was 'precipitate'; suggested some passages of the Bible for his consideration, and offered to send him the tract itself. The clergyman simply replied that the doctrine of baptismal regeneration was 'a fundamental and fatal error,' and added:—

'Were all the great and good men upon earth to advocate the doctrine, I would say with fearlessness, "My honoured and revered brethren, you know that if any man have not the spirit of Christ, baptized or not baptized, he is none of His.'

It need not be said that Pusey would have said so too; and that the statement had no bearings on the controversy, since a baptized person might have fallen from the state of salvation in which baptism had placed him, and be 'none of Christ's.' The perusal of the tract did not, it may well be imagined, produce any effect on the convictions of this self-confident clergyman. He was a little staggered at discovering what was Luther's belief on the subject: but then 'he called no man master upon earth.' The tract indeed satisfied him that Pusey was 'an honest and upright man,' but at the same time he reminded Pusey of

'the "I never knew you" which Christ will pronounce on all who are resolved on being deceived.'

A more useful criticism was that of Pusey's old antagonist, the Rev. H. J. Rose, who thanked him warmly for his 'learned and valuable tract.' But Pusey, he thought, ought to have answered the serious and pressing question, 'What is that grievous sin after baptism which involves a falling from grace¹?' And too much was said about the

¹ 'Tracts for the Times,' Nos. 67, 68, 69, pref. p. xiv, 1st edition.

effects of post-baptismal sin in the case of those who had been baptized as infants. Parents do not teach their children so generally as Pusey supposed that they are put in trust with a Divine gift; and infant baptism does not presuppose a moral choice which is repudiated by post-baptismal sin.

‘If an adult comes in sincerity to baptism from heathenism or not, he comes with a sense of the burden of sin, the blessing of deliverance, the misery of slavery to it. If he, after these feelings, relapses, then his case is surely very different from that of the infant, who, at all events, never can have had these *subsidiary* guards and aids.’

Pusey’s statement of the effects of post-baptismal sin in his tract on Baptism has often been exaggerated; he has even been accused of Novatianism. The truth is that, as faith in the grace of baptism had declined, so a sense of the grievousness of post-baptismal sin had been correspondingly lost. A forgotten truth can rarely be recovered without risks of one-sidedness or exaggeration. It must be isolated if justice is to be done to its importance; and such isolation, without great care, may easily be taken for more than a method of study which has no real counterpart in the realm of objective fact. Even Rose understood Pusey to teach ‘no remission of sin after baptism’; and reminded him of St. John’s words, ‘If any man sin we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the Righteous,’ of the Absolution in the Daily Service, and of the collect for Ash-Wednesday. Such an objection, which implied the incompleteness of his tract, Pusey had in his own mind already anticipated. ‘From the moment of my completing the tract on Baptism,’—he said in later years—‘I felt that I should have written on Christian repentance, on confession and absolution.’

In 1839 there appeared a second edition of the tract on Baptism, or rather of the first of the three tracts originally devoted to that subject. In this second edition the doctrinal statement on the subject of baptism is unchanged; but the discussion is much more methodical, and the Scriptural evidence is collected and expanded with greatly

increased force¹. The character of a popular tract designed to make an immediate impression is exchanged for that of a section of a theological treatise.

‘My object,’ he writes to Newman in September, 1839, ‘in my second edition of Part I. of my tract has been to bring together all the teaching of Holy Scripture in which it speaks directly of baptism, to point out how this was understood by the ancient Church, and to show how much higher notions of the Sacrament Scripture, honestly understood, would give than people are wont to entertain. It has grown, as you have seen perhaps, from 49 pages to 400, which may be a sufficient apology for the delay of Part II.’

Part II. was delayed indefinitely. Not long after the appearance of the first edition of the tract Harrison pressed Pusey to discuss adult baptism. But Pusey had not found that it raised difficulties as infant baptism did. He had not been reading up the subject. By-and-by he would like to do something, as it would enable him ‘more distinctly to take up the ground of the Fathers, and bring out the relation of infant and adult baptism.’ But, he added :—

‘When will “by-and-by” come? I feel that my by-and-by ought not to stand in any other’s way; and my own wishes lead me, as you know, to Absolution and the Lord’s Supper.’

Two years later, when the second edition of Part I. was preparing, he wrote to Keble :—

‘Part II. will be suspended till I can read about Absolution.’

And to Harrison :—

‘The remainder must wait awhile until I can read more on Absolution, and the absolving influence of the Holy Eucharist. On Absolution I have not yet met with anything which goes exactly to the point I want, namely, What are its precise effects if received rightly? how far does it restore one who has fallen into grievous sin? in what state does it place him relatively to the Day of Judgement?’

Thus it was that the two later tracts of the original edition were never expanded or republished. The pressure

¹ It is from the later editions that in order to do justice to Pusey’s quotations have been mainly made, mature mind.

of other questions obliged Pusey, reluctantly enough, to abandon a design which he long cherished. As it is, his account of the rationalistic initiative of Zwingli, and of Calvin's relation to it, is not fully superseded by any later treatment of the subject; and his discussion of modern objections to the doctrine of baptismal grace might have been enlarged into a work that would have made a great deal of later criticism impossible.

'But I was allowed to do,' Pusey said, 'that which after all was of the first importance; I mean, to show that our regeneration in baptism is taught in Holy Scripture, as understood by those who lived nearer to the time of our Lord and the Apostles, and were, for other reasons too, more likely to understand it rightly, than we'.¹

It has already been noticed that with this tract it had been proposed to complete the series of 'Tracts for the Times.' But not only had the proportions of the work to which Pusey's paper extended given ample material for the continuation of the series beyond the time contemplated; it had also given opportunity for a reconsideration of what was required by the exigencies of the time, as well as opened up new ideas as to what the series might become.

In answer to the words already quoted from Newman's letter of August 9th, and after having seen the first portion of Pusey's tract, Froude writes:—

'September 4, 1835.

'The Tracts in their new form (if it is gone on with as Keble hopes) may become a sort of Apostolical review'.²

Newman had by this time abandoned his notion of discontinuing the Tracts, and saw in the light of Pusey's tract the possibility of a more important series issuing

¹ A third edition of Tract 67 was published in 1840, and a fourth in 1842. This last edition was issued, with a new title-page, as a separate treatise on 'The Doctrine of Holy Baptism, as contained in the Scriptures and thence enlarged upon by the Fathers'; the latter part of the

title of the second edition, 'as contrasted with the systems of modern schools,' being dropped altogether. In the last month of his life, during August, 1882, Pusey went through the fourth edition of this Tract with a view to its republication.

² Newman's 'Letters, &c.,' ii. 135.

under slightly modified conditions. He writes to Froude on September 10th:—

‘We mean the Tracts should formally take up the Popish question. . . . Keble is delighted with Pusey’s tract on Baptism¹.’

Again, a month later to his friend J. W. Bowden:—

‘Dartington, October 10, 1835.

‘I am quite decided that I cannot be editor of the Tracts if they come out once a month, nor would I recommend any one else to be. It is the way to make them mere trash. One is pressed for time, and writes for the occasion stopgaps. I am conscious there are some stopgaps in the Tracts already. . . . We shall be losing credit and influence if we so go on. As I was strongly for short tracts on beginning, so am I for longer now. We must have much more treatises than sketches. I say all this from experience. As to how often, whether quarterly or on certain seasons, I have no view at present; but I foretell ruin to the cause if the Tracts go on by monthly dribblets².’

In October and November, it was still doubtful who should edit the altered series. It had been suggested that Keble might do so; but Keble writes to Newman on November 15th:—

‘As to my undertaking the Tracts for the next year, I really must consider it a little more seriously than I have done before I engage to do so. . . . If you want an immediate answer it must be in the negative: if not, we will consider it all over and over when I come up to lecture.’

He concludes his letter:—

‘By-the-by, why should not Pusey be editor of the Tracts? If you give up, surely on every account he is the fittest person. As far as I can judge, I very much approve of their being anti-Romanist³.’

In January it was necessary to come to a decision. The following extracts show what further considerations finally induced Newman to continue the publication:—

REV. J. H. NEWMAN TO E. B. P.

Tuesday, [January 12, 1836].

I am almost persuaded to continue the Tracts. Rivington writes me word this morning that the first volume is steadily selling and the

¹ Newman’s ‘Letters,’ ii. 136.

² *Ibid.* 137–8.

³ *Ibid.* 142–3.

second expected, and that he wants some more reprints. Again, I hear the *Record*, in summing up the events of the last year, laments the growth of High Church principles among those of whom they had hoped better things. Also the *Times* and *Standard* have undertaken to battle for and against the High Church. The *Standard* of this morning as follows (which it would not do except under the influence of fear).

‘We love not the men who dub themselves High Church : they have been the scandal and the weakness of the Church from the day of their parent Laud downward. They are half Papists, men who much prefer a Church without a religion—men who, in the true spirit of the Jewish priests, would condemn our Lord and His Apostles for turning the world upside down, and who practically renounce every principle consecrated by the blood of the Protestant Reformers. Generally they may be distinguished as half prig, half dandy, perfumed and powdered, and a little corpulent, one-third Protestant, one-third Papist, one-third Socinian—in profession altogether liberal, in pursuits wholly worldly¹.’

E. B. P. TO REV. J. H. NEWMAN.

Holton, Friday evening, [Jan. 15, 1836².]

My first thought about the Tracts was, ‘Well, if they are brought to an end’ (by outward means out of our control) ‘N. will have time for more solid productions.’ (This I wrote to you.) My second, regret that they must be given up, and a sort of feeling that their being protracted by means of my Baptism Tract beyond what we intended or wished, so as just to fill up the remainder of this year, was intended to give us a breathing-time, and yet enable us to carry them on. They were lengthened out against our will, so that we could not break them off when we would.

Then again, seeing that it would be a relief to you to suspend them for a while, I thought perhaps that they might have done their work, and they might be resumed less offensively under another name, e.g. [that of] our [Theological] Society; i.e. that we might gently let down the persons who have ignorantly declared against them. But I fear these persons have too far committed themselves and are too engrained with moderation, and being older than ourselves, and some vain, and accustomed to rule, they are less likely to give way, and our Society may very probably and (in proportion as it has any influence) will, I suppose, be more obnoxious than the Tracts.

Again, it is an object to follow up the blow.

What think you then of continuing the Tracts, not binding yourself

¹ Referring to this passage, which appears in the *Standard* of Jan. 11, 1836, Newman writes to J. W. Bowden: ‘My thoughts at once went to Pusey, as answering every point of it, especially the corpulence (!). It is a

sign we are somewhat growing when a talk is made between *Times* and *Standard*.’ ‘Letters,’ ii. 150.

² In Newman’s ‘Letters,’ ii. 133, this is undoubtedly incorrectly dated Sept. 4, 1835.

to monthly productions (which is worrying), nor again to quarterly (which might require too long ones), but producing them on the 1st of several months: if ready, well; if not, to wait for the next?

You might take the advantage (I mean) of Rivington's monthly circulation when you had anything ready, and when not, not 'fash yourself' about it.

Something to stem the tide of American dissenting divinity would be very useful. You need not bind yourself to produce a volume in 1836, or that the volume should be of a certain thickness.

I mean in my Preface to enter a protest against Mr. S[tanley]'s quotation and characterizing of the 'Tracts'; so I should like to see the pamphlet, but this will do when we meet. . . .

I think the Tracts are very valuable as a rallying-point: it keeps people in check to know that such opinions are held: they have a half-consciousness that they are true, or likely to be so; and they cannot follow their own inclinations to sink down the stream peacefully, as they would if there were no such bars. The leap is so much the broader and in proportion the more dangerous, and there may be from time to time some who will pause and examine whither we are all going.

REV. J. H. NEWMAN TO REV. J. KEBLE.

Oriel, January 16th, 1836.

. . . I think I am going on with them. On Monday I go to town and shall decide. The *Standard* is calling us 'third part Papist and third Socinian,' and Mr. Stanley [afterwards Bishop of Norwich] calls us an active and important party. Rivington has sent down for reprints for some of the first volume, which he says is steadily selling, and the *Edinburgh* is preparing an attack. Now since many of these notices are made under the impression that we are crypto-papists, here is an additional reason for Tracts on the Popish question¹.

These extracts show what an important part Pusey played at this critical juncture; that this was fully realized by Newman is clear from the following passage from the 'Apologia':—

'It was through him that the character of the Tracts was changed. . . . In 1835 he published his elaborate treatise on Baptism, which was followed by other Tracts from different authors, if not of equal learning, yet of equal power and appositeness².'

And Dean Church estimates with his usual accuracy the

¹ Newman's 'Letters,' ii. 132.

² 'Apologia pro Vita Sua' (ed. 1880), pp. 62-3.

need for such a change and Pusey's influence in producing it:—

‘To Dr. Pusey’s mind, accustomed to large and exhaustive theological reading, they [the earlier Tracts] wanted fullness, completeness, the importance given by careful arrangement and abundant knowledge. It was not for nothing that he had passed an apprenticeship among the divines of Germany, and had been the friend and correspondent of Tholuck, Schleiermacher, Ewald, and Sack. He knew the meaning of real learning. In controversy it was his sledge-hammer and battle-mace, and he had the strong and sinewy hand to use it with effect. He observed that when attention had been roused to the ancient doctrines of the Church by the startling and peremptory language of the earlier Tracts, fairness and justice demanded that these doctrines should be fully and carefully explained and defended against misrepresentation and mistake. Forgetfulness and ignorance had thrown these doctrines so completely into the shade that, identified as they were with the best English divinity, they now wore the air of amazing novelties; and it was only due to honest inquirers to satisfy them with solid and adequate proof¹.’

¹ Church’s ‘Oxford Movement,’ p. 118.

CHAPTER XVI.

THE HAMPDEN CONTROVERSY—BLANCO WHITE'S INFLUENCE—HAMPDEN, BAMPTON LECTURER—MORAL PHILOSOPHY PROFESSOR—APPOINTED REGIUS PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY—OPPOSITION—DR. ARNOLD'S VIOLENT ATTACK ON THE TRACTARIANS—HAMPDEN DISQUALIFIED—DEAN CHURCH'S JUDGMENT ON THE CONTROVERSY.

1836.

THE most important year in the history of the Oxford Movement was the year 1836¹. Several causes combined to make it so; but none so much as the controversy which was aroused by the appointment of Dr. Hampden to the Regius Professorship of Divinity. That controversy involved an appeal to first principles. It obliged men to ask themselves more seriously than before what after all was true; what they were prepared to defend as truth: it winnowed out the merely sentimental element from among adherents of the young Movement: it was at once a test of faith and a powerful incitement to action. The modern revolt against Christianity in Europe was, at least at the date of the Oxford Movement, traceable to two main sources. The French, or, more accurately, the Latin infidel, of the type of Voltaire, began by objecting to some indefensible feature whether of the creed or practice of the Church of Rome, and then proceeded to reject Christianity as a whole as being, in his view, responsible for what was really a foreign accretion to its faith and life. The infidel of the German type, on the other hand, possessed with boundless confidence in his capacity for judging all things Divine or human, seemed to fritter away whatever creed he might have had by a process of petty and incessant

¹ Cf. Newman's 'Letters,' ii. 177.

criticism. The English Deists, contemporary with the first, had much to do with the creation of the second school of unbelievers ; but they were distinct from both.

Blanco White represented the Latin type of unbelievers. His visit to England, and the development of his mind in a progressively infidel direction after his arrival, have had an effect upon English religious thought which has been imperfectly recognized. Of his great ability, of his wide reading, of his absolute sincerity of purpose, there can be no question. When he first came from Spain he was welcomed very widely as an important witness to the truth of the principles of the English Reformation ; and in Oxford he found himself among a company of able men, all of whom were, in various ways, interested in him. His mind was of an order to influence others by provoking antagonism as well as by commanding sympathy. Although he was on friendly terms with Newman and Pusey, they saw, after an interval of hope and hesitation, to what he was consciously or unconsciously moving. Thus he evoked in the Tractarian writers that reasoned and sensitive resistance to even incipient Rationalism which characterized all their writings. Of Blanco White's positive influence, it is not too much to say that he is the real founder of the modern Latitudinarian school in the English Church. Whately and Hampden were in different senses his pupils : Arnold and even Hawkins felt his positive influence, though less directly. Many years before he became a professed Socinian his eager, remorseless, unappeasable dialectic was gnawing away at all that was fundamental in the Christian creed and life. To minds with a bias towards a meagre creed and an easy theory of living, he was a welcome teacher. Whately and Hampden sat at his feet, as he laid down his theories on subjects of which they knew nothing, or pointed out supposed corruptions of Christianity, Primitive, Anglican, and even Protestant, no less than Roman, with the confidence that among his hearers no one could answer him. Whately, indeed, was a nimble dialectician, but Blanco White's was a much more powerful

mind than Whately's; and while Whately was entirely ignorant of any serious theological literature, and too scornful to make himself acquainted with it, Blanco White brought a vast mass of knowledge which may have silenced rather than interested him, and which he never assimilated. His influence on Whately was to sharpen the logician's anti-Church logic: his influence on Hampden was to provide a receptive student with new and ample material. The literature of Scholasticism, of which nobody in Britain, except one or two metaphysicians, knew anything, was to Blanco White perfectly familiar ground; and Blanco White not only directed Hampden's attention to this new field of reading, but furnished him with the bias with which he was to read it. It is within the truth to say that but for Blanco White's visit to Oxford, Hampden's *Bampton Lectures* could never have been written¹.

In the year 1832 Dr. Hampden had preached the *Bampton Lectures* on 'The Scholastic Philosophy considered in its relation to Christian Theology.' His purpose was to show that much of the public language and even of the faith of Christendom and the Church of England was not properly speaking Christian, but an accretion of later and foreign growth with which the simple creed of Apostolic Christendom has been overlaid. This foreign element he termed, with historical inaccuracy, Scholasticism; it was partly metaphysic and partly logic; it was, in his view, a product of the primitive and patristic, as well as of the mediaeval and scholastic theology. Accordingly in the *Bampton Lectures* he set himself to separate original Christianity, as he conceived it, from the overgrowth of later ages; and in doing this he certainly made havoc—as of other things too—of the authoritative

¹ Hampden's indebtedness to Blanco White has been sometimes exaggerated. But that it was very considerable—as indeed was natural—is certain. Archdeacon Hare's theory of Hampden's originality and relation to Bishop Butler's principles ('Some Memorials of R. D. Hampden,' Long-

mans, 1871, p. 29) is answered in Mozley's '*Reminiscences*,' vol. i. c. 56, 2nd edition. The true germ of the '*Bampton Lectures*' is to be found in Blanco White's '*Facts and Inferences*.' Cf. '*Life of J. B. White*,' iii. 362, Append.

language of the English Church. The Creeds, the statement of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity and of the Atonement, at least as to its revealed effect as towards God, the Church's language about original sin, grace, faith, and the sacraments,—all were, in their Anglican no less than their Roman Catholic form, tainted by Scholasticism, by some deposits of a false philosophy and by an old-world belief in magic.

If Hampden was right, it would seem that much of the Prayer-book ought to be rewritten, unless indeed it is permissible to address to Almighty God language which it is wrong to employ when speaking about Him. Especially the Creeds, not only the Athanasian but the Nicene, require rewriting if Hampden's principles¹ are to be accepted; since the Creeds employ terms which, although expressing truth taught in Scripture, are not themselves found in Scripture, and are the products of long discussion.

Hampden's lectures at any rate challenged those principles, the maintenance of which has been found in the long run necessary to that of the Christian faith. These are, the principle of dogma, in other words, of definite apprehension and statement of the object of faith; the principle of sacramental grace, that is, the communication of Divine force to the soul of man through covenanted channels; and the principle of the Church's authority in controversies of faith, whereby she provides, even if it be in a new terminology, such safeguards for the unchanging faith of her children as the everchanging circumstances of human thought may require. And in challenging these principles Hampden necessarily found himself confronted by the writers of the 'Tracts for the Times.'

It has often been asked, as by Arnold in the *Edinburgh Review*, why Hampden's lectures, which were delivered in 1832, were not answered or condemned at the time. It appears that at the time they attracted little notice. They were not very animated compositions; and they were moreover believed to be the echo, if not something more

¹ 'Bampton Lectures,' p. 544.

than the echo, of the thoughts of a much more powerful mind than Hampden's—that of Blanco White.

But if Hampden was under great obligations to Blanco White, and indeed owed him the solitary element which imparted to his lectures whatever there was in them of original enterprise, he was not the man to go all lengths with his master, or even so far as some of his critics apprehended. His intellect was, in fact, too sluggish and unsympathetic; and, let it be added, his heart was too religious. He takes up Blanco White's theory of an early and corrupt addition to original Christianity produced by a false logic and metaphysic; he handles it with the delight that a new mental toy inspires in most men at a certain time of life; but, as it would seem, he never assimilates it. Even in the Bampton Lectures, we may observe his new speculative solvent and his old religious mind lying side by side in a grotesque and illogical juxtaposition: and when the controversy about the Bampton Lectures was over, and he had become a Bishop, he dropped their most characteristic features as utterly as though they had never been present to his mind at all: he repeated the Creeds and used the accustomed theological language of the Church as though nothing were less possible than that any valid objection to them could possibly be urged. This would not have been the case with a mind of more consistency, thoroughness, and depth; or with a character in which intellectual eccentricity was unchecked by a sense of religious obligation. But even in the heat of the controversy Pusey, with mingled charity and acuteness, saw what was really Hampden's condition. After stating his belief that Hampden's 'personal faith still survives,' and his hopes that it would survive 'unharm'd by the philosophical system which had been admitted into the intellect,' he goes on to observe that

'This is a very frequent case; it is a blessing annexed by God to religious education, and steadfastness in religious practice. The belief is there so fixed as not to be readily shaken or destroyed by what under other circumstances becomes fatal to it. Hence we see repeatedly in

the history of the Church persons setting out at different times with the same maxims and principles, but the one following them to Socinianism or infidelity, the other restrained by the power of God within them, and stopping short in the communion of the Church, blessedly although inconsistently. The heart believeth, while the intellect ought consistently to disbelieve. In a yet extremer case, the Rationalists of Germany have at last seen what had long ago been pointed out to them by the believing writers, that their position was of all the most inconsistent; that they must, if consistent, return to a sounder faith, or plunge deeper into Pantheism. The division is now being made: some sinking into this form of atheism, others returning to Christianity. Yet they, for these threescore years, have been boasting themselves of what now appears to have been intellectually inconsistent¹.

Indeed, Blanco White himself, who had anticipated great things from Hampden's lectures, was not slow to express his disappointment at the actual result².

At the time, then, of their delivery and publication the Bampton Lectures of 1832 had not, to all appearance, attracted more attention than such compositions usually do. They had indeed created great anxiety and provoked earnest disapprobation in some of their few hearers or readers; but men

'indulged themselves in the hope that no harm would come, and that it would be unnecessary for them to interrupt their own avocations and the peace of the place by a formal accusation, or a necessarily very serious controversy³.'

This dream ought to have been dispelled in 1833 by the nomination of Dr. Hampden to the Headship of St. Mary Hall by the Chancellor of the University, and by his appointment to the Professorship of Moral Philosophy by the Vice-Chancellor, Proctors, and some Heads of Colleges in the following year. But with these appointments Convocation had no concern; and residents who were only members of Convocation were not called on to act, and only 'murmured in secret.' Of this feeling evidences were not wanting⁴;

¹ Dr. Hampden's 'Theological Statements, &c.' Oxford, Baxter, 1836, p. iv.

² Mozley's 'Reminiscences,' i. 353,

2nd edition.

³ *British Critic*, April 1836, p. 486.

⁴ Such were the subsequently cancelled preface to a 'Collection of

but there were strong reasons of a personal character against doing anything. Hampden was connected by College ties with those who felt most strongly that his lectures were very mischievous¹. Newman could not forget that 'Hampden had been employed by the Provost of Oriel to oust himself and the other tutors, and this made it difficult, if not impossible, for him to attack Hampden's theology without at least the appearance of a personal motive².' Added to which there was the prescriptive orthodoxy with which the 'Bampton Lectures' were still invested in the minds of the majority of his hearers, and the dull untheological temper of the time, which was not of a kind to be easily roused on questions of doctrinal error. Nothing more would have been heard of the lectures if Dr. Hampden had exchanged his tutorship at Oriel for a country living.

But Hampden was Professor of Moral Philosophy, and in October, 1835, he published a 'Course of Lectures introductory' to the study. Like his pamphlet on Subscription, which Newman regarded as the first act of aggression on the orthodox position, these lectures were not calculated to allow the objectors to his earlier course to forget him. On their appearance, Rose wrote to Newman:—

THE REV. H. J. ROSE TO REV. J. H. NEWMAN.

January 1, 1836.

Quousque tandem? How long are such books as Hampden's to come forward from professors and Heads of Houses? How long are they to come forth unreprieved?

Hampden's lectures are such an aggravation of the offence of his former book, are in themselves so mischievous, and so anti-Christian, that it does seem to me something very like a public calamity that they should be allowed to pass with no rebuke more weighty than an anonymous review.

For several years the same injurious policy has been pursued—the policy of silence—of trusting that the books would not be much read, and that the poison would not work. And in Hampden's case, if

Tracts on Subscription,' written by the Rev. J. Keble, and R. I. Wilberforce's 'The Foundations of the Faith assailed in Oxford,' originally intended to appear in the same volume.

¹ Cf. Newman's preface to the 'Elucidations of Dr. Hampden's Theological Statements.'

² Mozley's 'Reminiscences,' ii. 352.

obscurity, harshness, and vagueness could cause a writer to be neglected, the defence would be in some degree valid. But it is forgotten that when books come forth from persons in a high official station with a whole University *apparently* at their back, if no remonstrance is made on the part of such a body, the sentiments conveyed must be taken (and pretty fairly) as those commonly received in the body itself. Ten years hence might not a student fairly suppose H.'s doctrines, delivered in a professor's chair, *published*, dedicated to his electors, and *unreproved*, to be the authorized ones—and might he not be fatally injured? Ought not something to be done—and how can it best be done? *Equidem commoveor animo*, as I suppose you will say, I need not tell you. But these repeated attacks on one's endurance are too much. Arnold versus Episcopacy and the Study of Divinity was our last New Year's gift. Now we have a Christmas-box (? Pandora's) from St. Mary Hall.

Newman forwarded this letter to Pusey with the observation that silence about such books as Hampden's was 'a deplorable evil; a breach, it seems to me, of Vincentius' great rule that—as a witness for posterity—error should be protested against on its first appearing.'

After this correspondence, it is hardly to be wondered at that the appointment of Hampden by such a minister as Lord Melbourne to the position of leading theological teacher in Oxford, should have been felt to be a summons to a University battle on behalf of English orthodoxy. In those days the University belonged to the Church: its members were all members of the Church, and its teachers the trusted guardians of their faith. Hampden's teaching seemed so plainly beyond the most liberal interpretation of the somewhat unscientific frontiers of the English formularies, that an emphatic protest was felt to be necessary. And in judging the tactics of this strange contest it is necessary to bear in mind the conditions of University life in those days, so different from what they are now. When in 1841, 1843, and 1845 two of the prominent assailants of 1836 were attacked by the same weapons, they had no remorseful regret for having themselves employed them. They only resented the unfairness of applying such methods to those who only claimed to teach what is legitimately contained in the formularies of the English Church.

Whether they were right in their contention is a question which must be left to impartial minds judging in the light of later experiences of the Church.

The beginning of January 1836 found Pusey on a visit to his mother at Holton Park. He had completed the substance of his three tracts on Baptism in the preceding November; he had preached before the University on December 6th, and was writing the preface to the first edition of the tract. Dr. Burton, the Regius Professor of Divinity, had gone down to Ewelme for rest; had returned to Oxford with a fever, and had died on January 19th. On January 25th Pusey attended the funeral at Ewelme. Three days previously he wrote to Newman :—

‘People here were very sanguine at the very moment when his spirit had actually left us : so it was a more than ordinarily great shock. I heard some brief account which Dr. Barnes had from Mrs. Burton, of a full conversation which our friend had had with her the preceding Sunday. It was very satisfactory, and bespoke a cheerful resigned confidence. After that he was kept necessarily very quiet, as the only earthly prospect of retaining life, but he was at that time fully persuaded of his approaching end.

Everything everywhere seems dark : my great comfort is that I can do nothing and have nothing to do : it is comparatively easy to sit by and look on and wait the result ; and this is a privilege rarely allowed one in these times, and so to be treasured the more thankfully. Rose wished to have something done about H. : he seems much afraid of his being named. I should fear it was impossible to stir authorities here : there are no theologians ; and I suppose at all events we should hear some rumours before the office is filled up, and then it might suffice to bustle yourself and them. Rose wants you to “bell the cat.” I am weary of reading in order to censure : it is a hurtful office, and my study of Zwingli, &c. in the summer was more than enough for some time. Yet, if you think it advisable, I could put something in my preface of Dr. H.’s views of the Sacraments ; two statements of which I have noticed, although without the name, in the tract. This is a sort of protest, although little enough of one.’

These concluding words show well the reluctance with which Pusey entered on the contest, and how thoroughly he appreciated the dangers of the controversial attitude which, nevertheless, from time to time during his long life, the constraining sense of duty compelled him to adopt.

Newman replied to Pusey's depressed letter in terms of great buoyancy.

THE REV. J. H. NEWMAN TO E. B. P.

Richmond, January 24, 1836.

I had intended not to have written to you, but to have sent a message through Mozley—however, I change my mind. I cannot help fearing you are fussing yourself, which you must not do.

I do not look at things so sadly as you do: that is, doubtless we shall have a great deal to distress us, but it will rather be the bringing to light of what seems fair and is not, than a real declension. On the other hand rather, as error is brought out, the good will not only be disengaged and move freely and healthily, but be propagated by the agitation. Surely we have been for years in a very unsatisfactory deceptive state. We cannot regret, however we may be incidentally pained, that we should see ourselves as we are. Men like Ogilvie or others of the old Bartlett Buildings school¹ are worthy of all reverence and gratitude: but these have been the few. The mass of those called High Church have had no principles—their turning round now shows it. Can we say B., &c., &c., ever were fixed, ever saw the Truth? They go by expedience, because they have not ascertained, in those respects in which they veer about, any other guide. Is it not very clear that the English Church subsists *in the State*, and has no internal consistency (in matter of fact, I do not say in theory) to keep it together? is bound into one by the imposition of Articles and the inducement of State protection, not by *ἡθoς* and a common faith? If so, can we regret very much that a deceit should be detected? Surely not, though we might think we had no right ourselves to disturb what we found established.

The Heads of Houses do not see the difference between H[ampden] and orthodoxy. Very well! Then H. is not so far from representing their opinions. The authorities of the place virtually speak out, if he is made professor, what before was latent in their opinions and feelings. London is overrun with peculiarism—well and good—the facility of the change is a token of our former unsound state, when we seemed more orthodox. In such a state of things surely it is better for *us* to have the *opportunity* of speaking our mind. Poor Keble's spirit was vexed for years while he felt the evil but could not grasp it: he seemed visionary and eccentric, while he was eating his heart, unsuccessfully attempting to analyze his own presagings, and to express a disapprobation which he could not help feeling. Are we not better off? Is not ours a state of hope? Have we not started the game? Is it not better to fight in light than in darkness? To me there is this remarkable token (if I may venture to say it) in our recent loss: it is as if Pro-

¹ The buildings originally occupied by the S. P. C. K.

vidence were clearing the *μεταίχμιον*, and forcing men to choose their side. He who has been taken represented and upheld more than any one else the middle party. There is no one to take his place in reputation, in learning, in good report. Were Shuttleworth appointed, which on the whole I should prefer, he could do nothing against us—he has no popularity, no insight into antiquity, no clearness or grasp of mind, and (at his age) little energy or desire of contest. I cannot help thinking he would be nothing at all, and we might act as if *sede vacante*. On the other hand, were H. or other such appointed, numbers would approximate to us and open themselves to our views, from fear of him, who at present are suspicious of us. Really, thank God, it would seem as if for our comfort it were graciously explained to us by sight, what we know by faith, that all things must work for us. I seem to feel very easy and cheerful about it, though I doubt not, did a bad appointment take place, I should be for the time keenly pained, as with the smart of a wound, from natural feeling. . . .

As for yourself, my dear Pusey, you have nothing to do but keep quiet in mind as well as body—you admit the latter. *Pie repone te*. I recollect when I was in at the examination for Fellowship at Oriel, and very much harassed and almost sinking, I happened to look up at the window and saw that motto on the painted glass. The words have been a kind of proverb to me ever since. Really we have nothing to fear: and, after all, it will be a great thing if 'in that Day' our own 'life be given us as a prey.'

I wish to say something kind and consolatory, yet do not know how.

With kindest remembrances to Mrs. Pusey,

Ever yours most affectionately,

JOHN H. NEWMAN.

On February 2nd Pusey writes to Mr. Gladstone:—

'We are under great anxiety as to our new professor. Rumour mentions Keble's name. But this would be too great a blessing for us to dare, in these days, to hope for, though we may pray for it.'

Meanwhile the Prime Minister had made up his mind. On the day of Dr. Burton's funeral, January 25, 1836, he had written as follows to Archbishop Whately:—

'I now beg leave to submit to you and ask your opinion on a list which has been given me by the Archbishop of Canterbury of persons whom he conceives to be best qualified to succeed to Dr. Burton:—

Mr. Pusey, the Professor of Hebrew.

Dr. Shuttleworth, Master (*sic*) of New College.

Mr. Ogilvie, late Fellow of Balliol College (one of the Archbishop's Chaplains).

Mr. Newman, of Oriel.

Mr. Keble, of Oriel.

Mr. Miller, of Worcester College.

Dr. Short, Rector of St. George's, Bloomsbury.

Dr. Goddard, Archdeacon of Lincoln.

'From another quarter there has been mentioned to me Dr. Cramer, Head of New Inn Hall¹.'

The names stand in the order of recommendation, and no one would have been more surprised than Pusey to learn that his name was first on the list. It will be observed that each of the three leaders of the Movement, as they subsequently became, was named by the Archbishop for the vacant Chair of Divinity. What might not have been the result on the future of the English Church had any one of them been chosen?

A very different event was in store for her. On the advice of Archbishop Whately and Bishop Copleston, all the names recommended by Archbishop Howley were passed over, and in their place Dr. Hampden was suggested. Lord Melbourne had already marked this clergyman out for preferment, and he now submitted his name to Archbishop Howley. The Archbishop at first approved; but he soon had occasion to regret that he had done so, when the agitation which followed the announcement of the appointment had brought under his notice features of Dr. Hampden's writings with which he was previously unacquainted.

The news of the appointment reached Oxford on Monday, February 8th.

'People,' wrote the young James Mozley to his sister, 'began to bestir themselves immediately. That very day Pusey gave a dinner to the leaders of orthodoxy in the University, at which Newman, and Hook of Coventry, who happened to be up as select preacher, and others, were present. A petition was agreed to, to be signed by the resident masters, expressive of their condemnation of Hampden's tenets, and their entire want of confidence in him. However, a dinner-

¹ 'Lord Melbourne's Papers.' Longmans, 1889, p. 497.

party was not to settle everything ; and a public meeting was the next thing to think of¹.

Hampden's appointment, it will be remembered, was not yet certain. Could it be averted? That question kept Oxford in incessant agitation for ten days. At this first stage of the matter Newman took the lead, and certainly did not spare himself. He sat up all night to compose his well-known 'Elucidations' of Dr. Hampden's teaching. The most important feature of the agitation was a series of meetings in the Corpus Common Room, the first of which was held on Wednesday, February 10th. A petition against Hampden's appointment, addressed to the King, was read and agreed on. By the evening it had received forty-five signatures, and the next evening it was sent to the Primate with seventy-three signatures—half the resident masters—for presentation to His Majesty. The petitioners anxiously disclaim all wish to interfere with the royal prerogative, but they apprehend the most disastrous consequences to the soundness of the faith of those whom Dr. Hampden would have to educate for the sacred ministry of the Church. It was essential to the discharge of the duties of the Regius Professor of Divinity that he should possess the full confidence of those who were engaged in educating young men at Oxford. The King was implored to listen to the representations which would be made to him by the heads of the Church.

On the 13th, Newman's 'Elucidations of Dr. Hampden's Theological Statements' appeared. The title of the pamphlet implied that obscurity was a characteristic of Hampden's writing; the pamphlet consists mainly of extracts from Dr. Hampden's works, grouped and prefaced with a few words of introduction, and intended 'to assist the judgments of those who are in doubt as to his doctrines, and to explain the earnestness of those who condemn them².' The Hebdomadal Board also was requested to summon

¹ 'Letters of J. B. Mozley, D.D.,'
pp. 50, 51.

² 'Elucidations of Dr. Hampden's
Theological Statements,' p. 4.

Convocation with a view to sending a further petition to the King in the name of the University. Hampden himself was present at the meeting of the Board, which decided not to grant this request. Pusey wrote to Lord Melbourne what Newman calls 'one of his most earnest, weightiest, crushing letters'¹. Everything failed. The Ministry were unmoved, only Sir Charles Wood, afterwards Lord Halifax, opposing the appointment². The King made no sign; Lord Melbourne thought the 'Elucidations' 'abstruse,' and told Pusey, with reference to the memorial to the King, that 'another time it would be wise, if he wanted anything done, to go to those who could *do* it,' meaning of course the Minister, and not the King³. The appointment was formally announced, bearing date in the *Gazette* of Wednesday, February 17.

But it was still possible for the University to express its disapproval of the teaching of the new Regius Professor. Accordingly several other meetings were held at Corpus, at which petitions were drawn up to the Hebdomadal Board, desiring that Convocation should in some way have an opportunity of expressing its opinion on the subject. A committee was also appointed to draft a Report and a public Declaration, and to select from Dr. Hampden's works such statements as would be seen to justify the opposition to his appointment. This Report and Declaration were soon circulated. They both betray Pusey's hand, but the concluding paragraphs of the Report are better worth reproducing than the more guarded and stilted language of the Declaration. The former runs thus:—

'After a most careful and systematic research, they [your committee] entreat you to bear in mind that the present controversy is not so much concerned with an individual or a book, or even an ordinary system of false doctrine, as with a *Principle*, which, after corrupting all *soundness of Christianity* in other countries, has at length appeared among us, and for the first time been invested with authority in the University of Oxford.

¹ Newman's 'Letters and Correspondence,' ii. 158.

² J. B. Mozley's 'Letters,' p. 53.

³ Newman's 'Letters and Correspondence,' ii. 181.

'This principle is the *philosophy of Rationalism*, or the assumption that uncontrolled human reason in its present degraded form is the primary interpreter of God's Word, without any regard to those rules and principles of interpretation which have guided the judgements of Christ's Holy Catholic Church in all ages of its history and under every variety of its warfare. It is the *Theory of Rationalism* (as set forth systematically in the Bampton Lectures of 1832, and still more recently in lectures addressed to students) which is to be considered the root of all the errors of Dr. Hampden's system.

'And, far as they are from imputing to its maintainer personally those unchristian doctrines with which it is clearly connected, or the consequences inevitably flowing from it, they cannot forget that the poison of unbelief (now working so deeply in another country) was first disseminated by a man piously educated (Semler), and who lived to deplore most deeply the effects of his successful rashness.'

The Declaration, which the Report recommended for signature, repeats in other words the language of these paragraphs¹.

It would be a mistake to suppose that the opposition to Dr. Hampden's appointment was confined to the writers of the 'Tracts for the Times' and their friends. It included all phases of opinion in the Church of England, except that phase which was in sympathy with Latitudinarianism; but the direction of the opposition fell by the force of things into the hands of Newman and Pusey. They saw more clearly than others what was really at stake; they brought to the controversy not feeling merely, but knowledge; they knew their own minds, and they knew, from their very different experience, the strength and the weakness of rationalistic theories. Moreover, they imported into the question a moral intensity which strong convictions alone can give; and so, whether other men would or no, they were, and were recognized by friend and foe alike as being, at the head of the opposition to the appointment—not merely by their intimate friends and

¹ That Pusey had more to do with the Declaration itself than with the Report may perhaps be inferred from the fact that while the Report speaks of the 'poison of unbelief now working so deeply in another country,' the De-

claration in its last paragraph alludes to it as a past or passing influence. Pusey was at this time still hopeful about the future of German Protestantism.

pupils, but by many who had little or no sympathy with the Tracts. It may suffice to mention the Rev. Thomas Short, of Trinity, the Rev. R. L. Cotton, then Fellow and Tutor of Worcester, the Rev. C. P. Golightly, of Oriel College, the Rev. H. B. Wilson, Fellow and Tutor of St. John's, besides Mr. Hill, the Vice-Principal of St. Edmund Hall, who was a member of the committee. The Declaration was signed by eighty resident members of Convocation.

Meanwhile Dr. Hampden, as was perhaps natural, had taken measures of his own. He appealed to the Duke of Wellington as Chancellor of the University, informing him that a statute was under consideration which, under cover of depriving the Regius Professor of Divinity of certain rights and powers attached to his office, would really pass a censure on his theological writings. The Duke was requested to institute an inquiry into the legal and statutable propriety of the measure in question.

'You,' replied the Duke, 'are a member of the Board of Heads of Houses ; I, as Chancellor, at a distance from Oxford, have no voice at that Board. I refer the letter to the Vice-Chancellor¹.'

But before this answer was received, the Heads of Houses had decided, after no little hesitation whether anything at all should be done, to bring before Convocation the statute referred to by Dr. Hampden. It provided that the new Regius Professor, having so treated theological subjects, 'ut in hac parte nullam ejus fiduciam habeat Universitas,' he was not to be on the Board which nominated select preachers, and he was not to be consulted when a sermon was called in question before the Vice-Chancellor. The censure of Dr. Hampden's opinions implied in this proposal is sufficiently obvious. At the Hebdomadal Board thirteen Heads of Houses were in favour of the statute : eight opposed it, and they were reinforced by the two proctors. Among the members of the majority, besides

¹ 'Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury, explanatory of Proceedings at Oxford.' London, Fellowes, 3rd ed., pref. pp. ii-v.

the Vice-Chancellor, were Dr. Jenkyns (Master of Balliol), Dr. Routh (President of Magdalen), Dr. Gilbert (Principal of Brasenose), Dr. Gaisford (Dean of Christ Church), Dr. Symons (Warden of Wadham), and Dr. Wynter (President of St. John's). Dr. Hampden himself, as Principal of St. Mary Hall, voted with the minority, which contained one name of high distinction, that of Dr. Hawkins, the Provost of Oriel.

Convocation was summoned for March 22nd to consider this proposal. Copies of the proposed statute, together with the Declaration of the Corpus Committee, and appended names of signatures, reinforced by a long list of extracts from Dr. Hampden's works, were widely circulated among members of Convocation.

On March 12th Pusey published a pamphlet¹ which was intended to supplement Newman's 'Elucidations,' and consisted of extracts from Dr. Hampden's writings, introduced by a preface of his own. The preface is an able review of some leading characteristics of Hampden's teaching. Pusey compared him with Semler, a man of personal faith and piety who played with rationalistic principles but lived to deplore the havoc which they wrought. Hampden's main position, that every statement not presented in the language of Scripture is an addition to the naked truth of the Gospel, was shown to be that of every negative system that has assumed the title of Christianity. 'Scholasticism,' a term which had been historically used to describe the 'peculiar speculative theology of the Schoolmen,' was applied by Dr. Hampden to the general teaching of the Primitive Church; every statement of the Creeds, not confined to the bare statement of a Scriptural fact, was condemned by him as 'Theory,' 'Scholasticism,' or 'Realism.' How Dr. Hampden's theory might lead on through Sabellianism to Socinianism was shown by reference to the case of Mr. Blanco White; and the preface closes with a word of apology for

¹ 'Dr. Hampden's Theological Statements and the Thirty-nine Articles compared: by a Resident Member

of Convocation, with a Preface, and Propositions extracted from his works.' Oxford, Baxter, 1836.

the part the writer was taking. It was an invidious task which he would gladly have been spared: but events brought it into his way, so he could not shrink from it. Hampden's friends hardly did Pusey justice when they urged as they did that he was animated by motives of personal hostility, or even of disappointed ambition.

The body of the pamphlet consisted partly of brief propositions extracted from or alleged to be maintained by Dr. Hampden; partly of longer quotations designed to illustrate his phraseology; and partly of other passages from Dr. Hampden's works, arranged in parallel columns with the contrasted language of the Articles. Of these the propositions were the work of Pusey: the two following sections were contributed by Harrison.

'I have been myself,' he writes to Mr. Gladstone on March 8th, 'hard at work, chiefly on the Bampton Lectures, making extracts for Pusey, who will publish them with a preface, entering on the main points of Hampden's theological system, if indeed one can call such a *farrago* a *system*. My work has been to range passages from his writings in columns parallel with the statements of the Articles.'

Pusey however was responsible for the whole work; he probably corrected and enlarged it, and in his preface he accepts the responsibility. The short extracted propositions were sent round to members of Convocation with a view to influencing the vote of the 22nd of March, and thus they naturally challenged keen criticism¹. It may be that some of them are open to some of the objections which, ever since the days of Jansen, have been urged generally against the attempt to convey the true sense of an author by means of short extracts from his writings. The method, however equitable the intention, is liable to be inequitable in effect: the modifying and interpretative force of the context is often lost sight of; that which was incidental in the mind of the writers,

¹ 'The Propositions attributed to Dr. Hampden by Professor Pusey compared with the text of the Bampton Lectures in a series of Parallels, by

a Resident Member of Convocation.' London, Fellowes, 1836. This is attributed to Mr. Hayward Cox. Cox's 'Recollections of Oxford,' p. 284.

assumes as an isolated extract a much higher order of importance ; language is subjected to a strain which it was not originally intended to bear. An examination of the propositions themselves will show that Pusey was alive to this, and that he anxiously endeavoured to obviate it by introductory or supplemental words of his own. That he succeeded altogether it would be too much to assert ; all that can be said is that if the extracts sometimes exaggerate the errors of certain passages in the 'Bampton Lectures,' they sometimes fail to convey an adequate impression of others, the real extent and colouring of Hampden's characteristic positions depending upon large sections of language for its complete representation.

Hampden's inaugural lecture was delivered on the 17th. It was not calculated to make any change in the situation¹. It certainly showed that he had no designs hostile to the central truths of the Christian Revelation : his language about the Sacraments may even have surprised some of his critics by its primitive tone. But it contained no expression of regret for statements which had evoked justifiable remonstrance, nor did it in any way remove the general impression created by the 'Bampton Lectures,' which was that he was capable of, so to speak, playing with rationalistic fireworks without understanding the dangers of such a pastime. He further allowed himself to refer to the opposition to his appointment in terms which seemed at least unworthy of the high position he now held.

Pusey at once issued a criticism on this inaugural lecture : it appeared on March 21st,—the eve of the great day in Convocation. Its contents may be gathered from its title : 'Dr. Hampden's Past and Present Statements compared².' He had, so Pusey maintained, 'set forth a general popular statement of religious teaching, portions whereof are indeed in direct contradiction with what he before stated, but which in many cases does not even touch upon the

¹ 'Inaugural Lecture, read before the University of Oxford in the Divinity School on Thursday, March

17, 1836.' London, Fellowes, 1836.

² Oxford, Baxter, 1836.

questions his treatment of which had raised such serious apprehensions.'

On March 22nd Convocation met: at the least some 450 members were present; and the excitement was even greater than is usual on a field-day of this description. There was no doubt which way the voting would have gone; but the Proctors had announced, before the meeting, their intention of interposing their veto, which, according to the law of the University, would put an end to the proceedings; and indeed proceedings had been delayed for nearly two hours whilst the Hebdomadal Board discussed the question at what stage of the discussion the Proctors should intervene. In vain the majority sought some means of expressing their opinions. No sooner had the Vice-Chancellor put the question, *Placet or Non-placet*, than amidst a tremendous shout of '*Placet*' from the area the decisive formula was uttered, '*Nobis procuratoribus non placet*,' and the question of the statute was for the time at an end.

Pusey, Newman, and Keble were in the Theatre on that day. As Pusey walked up to take his seat among the Doctors in the semicircle he was hissed by some of Hampden's friends: they could only see in him a man 'who had attacked a friend who was his successful rival in the path of fame.' Newman and Keble were in the area; and the latter dryly observed on hearing the procuratorial veto that 'others too might play at that game.' Nine years afterwards, and on a much more important occasion, this saying was to be signally illustrated.

Foreseeing the action of the Proctors, the Corpus Committee had circulated a notice asking non-resident members of Convocation who were favourable to the proposed statute to meet immediately after the proceedings in the Hall of Brasenose College. At the meeting so summoned Pusey spoke. A resolution was agreed to, thanking the Corpus Committee for their 'wisdom, energy, Christian zeal and charity,' and pledging themselves to any exertions that might be necessary for continuing the struggle. At the same time, 385 signatures were attached to a petition

addressed to the Vice-Chancellor, begging him to lay before the Hebdomadal Board, at the earliest opportunity, the earnest entreaty of the signatories that some measure might be again submitted to Convocation, to clear the University from the charge of sanctioning such principles as Dr. Hampden's. Among the names attached to this petition is that of almost every one connected with the University of Oxford who took any prominent part in the Church movement: on this occasion men are still working earnestly side by side who were afterwards deeply separated by the progress of controversy. On the 7th of April the Brasenose petition was presented to the Vice-Chancellor, who undertook to lay it before the Board on the first meeting in Easter Term.

The Easter Vacation was spent in a ferment, for it was felt on both sides that the Proctors had not ended the controversy by the veto of March 22nd. New Proctors were to come into office on April 13th, and they might be otherwise-minded than their predecessors. Accordingly Hampden's friends set to work in good earnest. They would repay Hampden's assailants in kind. They published '*Specimens of the Theological Teaching of certain members of the Corpus Committee at Oxford.*' This was a collection of extracts from the writings of Newman, Pusey, and Sewell; but chiefly from Newman's '*Arians*' and '*Parochial Sermons.*' These extracts were introduced and followed by remarks apparently intended to parody the method, and to a certain extent the language, which had been employed by the editors of the extracts from the '*Bampton Lectures.*' Pusey also was paraphrased into opinions which he certainly did not hold.

About the same time appeared '*A Pastoral Epistle from His Holiness the Pope to some Members of the University of Oxford, faithfully translated from the original Latin.*' Of this discreditable production the author was Dr. Dickinson, a chaplain of Archbishop Whately¹, who after-

¹ Whately's '*Life.*' Longmans, 1875, p. 132, note.

wards became Bishop of Meath. The writer's patron does not appear to have viewed it with any marked disfavour, but 'its dishonesty of quotation, its unfairness, its irreverence, and low views of Christianity,' were pointed out by an Irish divine of real learning, the Rev. Dr. Todd¹.

In Dr. Dickinson's pamphlet the Pope is made to cast a favourable eye upon the Oxford Movement, and to quote so much of the 'Tracts for the Times' as might, with appropriate commentary and introduction, be made to point to a Roman Catholic conclusion. It may be questioned whether the Oxford writers might not well have agreed to take no notice of such a publication. They certainly could have afforded to overlook it, had its real author been known at the time. But current report assigned it to some writer nearer home of great influence; and Pusey hoped that as he personally had escaped the censures of the satirist his appeal would be listened to. Accordingly on St. Mark's Day, April 25, there appeared 'An Earnest Remonstrance to the author of the Pope's Pastoral Letter.' Pusey marks his sense of the character of the pamphlet which he was answering by the motto which he prefixes to his own. 'As a madman who casteth firebrands, arrows, and death, so is the man that deceiveth his neighbour, and saith, Am not I in sport?' His own 'Remonstrance' is throughout a dignified rebuke, in which he points out that the use of banter on such serious subjects involves gross irreverence, unfair dealing with opponents, or even with the truth, and the imputation of dishonesty to persons whom the writer knew to be honest. Pusey quotes Warburton's address to the freethinkers on the employment of ridicule, and with great effect; shows that the implied charge of the 'Pastoral Letter' against the Tracts was in reality a charge against some of the greatest

¹ This is done in the preface to the 2nd edition of his own 'Letter of our Most Holy Father by Divine Providence, Pope Gregory XVI., to the Archbishops and Bishops of Ireland,' 1st edition, London, 1836; 2nd edition, Dublin, 1836. It was in consequence of Dr. Todd adopting

this method of writing a controversial pamphlet that the stupid mistake was made of attributing to him Dr. Dickinson's 'Pastoral Epistle,' of which he speaks in terms of deserved severity. Cf. Cox's 'Recollections of Oxford,' p. 289.

² Proverbs xxvi. 18.

names in Anglican theology; and enlarges especially on the practice of prayers for the faithful departed as existing in the Primitive Church, and advocated by some Anglican divines, apart from any belief in purgatory. This portion of the 'Earnest Remonstrance' gave it a more than passing value, and probably led to its republication in the series of 'Tracts for the Times.'

But the most passionate attack upon the Corpus Committee, and especially upon Pusey and his friends, was an article that appeared during the vacation from the pen of Dr. Arnold. Arnold had long watched with increasing irritation the growth of Church principles at Oxford. For Arnold too had been and was keen about Church improvement; and he was committed to a theory of the Church's nature and functions which, however acceptable to certain phases and sections of modern opinion, had no real basis in the New Testament, and was in conflict with the principles which the writers in the Tracts were labouring to restore. Arnold divided the world into Christian and non-Christian; forms of Church government and means of grace counted for very little in his theory: to insist on them was to be narrow, antiquated, Judaizing, and what not. Arnold thought he had settled the matter; but he found men whose genius and character he could not dispute insisting upon an aspect of things which he thought he had disposed of, winning disciples, and commanding general attention. He, at Rugby, was out of the way: Oxford was the centre of this new and to him unwelcome enthusiasm; and the opposition to Hampden brought matters to a climax in his mind. For Hampden and Arnold were in substantial agreement. In both men the dislike of High Church principles was a department of their general dislike of political Toryism; both were endowed with a large share of self-reliance; both treated the commonplaces of Latitudinarianism as though they were precious and sacred axioms; both played for immediate objects with destructive arguments, the true drift of which they did not comprehend or even suspect, and which, as the event has too

surely proved, lead in a second generation to downright unbelief. According to Arnold, Hampden was 'doing what real Christian reformers had ever done; what the Protestants did with Catholicism, and the Apostles with Judaism.' 'Hampden's Bampton Lectures,' he wrote, 'are a great work, entirely true in their main points, and, I think, most useful.' On the other hand, 'it is clear to me,' he also wrote, 'that Newman and his party are idolaters; they put Christ's Church and Christ's sacraments and Christ's ministers in the place of Christ Himself.'

With these violent sentiments Arnold sat down to write his famous article on 'The Oxford Malignants and Dr. Hampden¹.' The editor of the *Edinburgh Review* suggested the title; but the title gives, it must be said, only an imperfect idea of the tone and contents of the article itself.

'The article,' says his biographer, 'contains the most startling and vehement, because the most personal, language which he [Arnold] ever allowed himself deliberately to use. The offence caused by it, even amongst his friends, was very great.'

In fact, it almost cost him the Head Mastership of Rugby. It is partly a narrative of the events of March 1836, which an eyewitness has described as mythical²; and partly an outburst of personal animosity against Newman and his friends, which must be read throughout to be appreciated. They are 'conspirators,'—the epithet is again and again repeated; they are 'obscure fanatics'; they are worse than Roman Catholic, or any other fanatics, since theirs is the 'fanaticism of mere foolery.' They and their followers have indeed had their prototypes in the later English Church:—

'They are the very Non-jurors and High Church clergy of King William's and Anne's and George the First's time, reproduced with scarcely a shade of difference. Now, as then, this party is made up of two elements; of the Hophni and Phinehas school on the

¹ *Edinburgh Review*, April, 1836.

² Mozley's 'Reminiscences,' i. 363 (2nd edition).

one hand—the mere low worldly clergy, careless and grossly ignorant—ministers not of the Gospel but of the aristocracy, who belong to Christianity only from the accident of its being established by law; and of the formalist Judaizing fanatics on the other hand, who have ever been the peculiar disgrace of the Church of England.’

This last epithet for the more immediate friends of Newman, Pusey, and Keble, or for themselves, was a favourite with Arnold: he expands what he means by it.

‘Once, however, and once only in the history of Christianity, do we find a heresy—for never was that term more justly applied—so degraded and low principled as this. We must pass over the times of Romanists, we must go back to the very beginning of the Christian Church; and there, in the Jews and Judaizers of the New Testament, we find the only exact resemblance to the High Churchman of Oxford. In the zealots of circumcision and the ceremonies of the law,—in the slanderers and persecutors of St. Paul,—the doters upon old wives’ fables and endless genealogies,—the men of soft words and fair speeches,—of a “voluntary humility” all the time that they were calumniating and opposing the Gospel and its great Apostle;—in the malignant fanatics, who to the number of more than forty formed a conspiracy to assassinate Paul, because he had denied the necessity of ceremonies to salvation,—the men of “mint and anise and cummin,” who cared not for judgement, mercy, and truth,—the enemies and revilers of the holiest names which earth reverences, and who are condemned in the most emphatic language by that authority which all Christians acknowledge as Divine;—in these, and in these alone, can the party which has headed the late Oxford conspiracy find their perfect prototype.’

After this it is almost tame to be told that

‘the attack upon Dr. Hampden bears upon it the character, not of error but of moral wickedness’;

and that if conscience were pleaded as a reason for opposing him,

‘it could only be a conscience so blinded by wilful neglect of the highest truth, or so corrupted by the habitual indulgence of evil passions, that it rather aggravates than excuses the guilt of those whom it misleads.’

Arnold’s article disposed once for all of the notion that the Latitudinarianism which he represented means toleration,

excepting on matters where its professors find toleration convenient. Such bigoted ferocity and insolence would have passed unheeded had they not proceeded from a man of high character and influence, who had had opportunities of learning for himself the real worth of the men whom he dared thus to vilify ; who had sat in the common-room of Oriel with them ; who had exchanged with them again and again assurances of respect, and even affection. Condemned as it was almost universally by those who shared Arnold's opinions, this unhappy paper, it is sad to add, was approved of by the man who should have been foremost in deploring it.

'The article,' wrote Dr. Hampden to the editor of the *Edinburgh Review*, 'is admirably done, and will contribute much, I have no doubt, to disabuse the public mind, and call forth the merited indignation against the authors of such outrageous proceedings¹.'

Those of Arnold's old friends who were the objects of his abuse could not but think with sincere regret of his production.

'A paper such as this,' wrote Pusey of the article, 'would not require notice from any Christian, and might be passed over in mere sorrow, but for one statement which is derived in some way from Dr. Hampden himself².'

Arnold had observed that what he calls a 'falsehood' had run through Pusey's theological statements as well as Newman's 'Elucidations': 'the technical language,' he says, 'in which truths have been expressed is carefully confounded with the truths themselves.' This led Pusey to re-examine the 'Bampton Lectures' more closely than before ; and he shows triumphantly how utterly unwarrantable is Arnold's criticism. In fact, Hampden quarrelled not merely with the language of the Church, contemptuously described as 'technical,' but with serious truths which that language was expressly intended to guard and convey ; truths which, in the judgment of the Church, although not in that

¹ 'Memorials of Bishop Hampden,' London, 1871, p. 64.

² 'An Earnest Remonstrance, &c.' Postscript, p. 38.

of Dr. Hampden, were taught in Holy Scripture¹. Indeed, Pusey infers from internal evidence that Arnold had never read Pusey's own pamphlet of theological extracts which he condemns: he had heard enough about it from some Oxford correspondent to describe some of its features, but his misrepresentation of its contents is too considerable to have been put forward by a writer who had made himself personally acquainted with it.

The Easter Vacation had ended, and on April 25th the Hebdomadal Board decided to re-introduce into Convocation the proposal which had been vetoed by the outgoing Proctors on March 22nd. A motion to this effect was brought forward in the Board by Dr. Cardwell, the Principal of St. Alban Hall, and seconded by Dr. Symons, the Warden of Wadham. On this occasion the new Proctors voted with the majority; the Senior Proctor was Mr. Robert Hussey, of Christ Church, whose learning and caution subsequently led to his becoming the first Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History. Convocation was to meet on May 5th, but the Corpus Committee anticipated the occasion by assembling on April 27th to adopt an address for circulation among Masters of Arts throughout the country. This address, besides repeating the general objections to Dr. Hampden's teaching, insists that his inaugural lecture had only made the protest more necessary. If the Bampton Lectures were to be viewed as only a history of the public phraseology employed by the Church in order to state and define revealed truth, they nevertheless did maintain that this phraseology was framed on a false and mischievous philosophy, foreign and injurious to the Gospel. It would follow, either that there were no realities corresponding to some of the most solemn language of the Church, or that the ideas conveyed by such language are unscriptural and false².

There were, of course, appeals from the other side. Members of Convocation were told that such a censure

¹ 'An Earnest Remonstrance,' pp. 38-41, postscript.

² Cf. Address, dated Oxford, April 26, 1836, p. 5.

on the Regius Professor was of doubtful legality, and they were entreated to consider the effect of such disputes upon the outside world. Oxford was not less thronged than it had been seven weeks before; the Sheldonian Theatre was again the scene of the conflict, but on this occasion Bachelors of Arts and undergraduates were excluded. Five Latin speeches were made in Dr. Hampden's favour, one of them by Dr. Marsham, the Warden of Merton; two in support of the statute, one by Mr. John Miller, the Bampton Lecturer of 1817, and the other by Keble. Arnold was in the Theatre, and it may be presumed was reflecting whether, as he had said of Hampden's opponents, the conscience of this last speaker 'had been blinded by the neglect of the highest truths, or corrupted by the habitual indulgence of evil passions¹.' The statute was accepted by a majority of 380—474 against 94; and the Regius Professor of Divinity was, during the pleasure of the University, deprived of the right of sitting at the Board of Inquiry into Heretical Doctrines, and at the Board of Nomination of Select Preachers.

Young men are always generous, and some of Pusey's younger friends thought that Hampden had been hardly used. Why had he not been remonstrated with in private? And if his teaching was so unsound, was not the measure adopted by Convocation a very inadequate one? To these criticisms Pusey replies:—

E. B. P. TO P. B. DUNCAN, ESQ.

Christ Church, May 13, 1836.

Why should you assume that 'private remonstrance' was not used, and so our Lord's words (St. Matt. xviii. 15) acted upon, as far as they apply? For this is not a case of *ἐὰν ἀμαρτήσῃ εἰς σέ*; it was not a private offence against us. Now, the fact is that 'private remonstrance' was used, and that by more than one individual, and very kindly; and in one case by a person whose intellectual powers every one here would respect, and who up to that time was living on

¹ *Edin. Rev.*, April 1836, p. 239.

terms of personal friendship with Dr. H. And the Corpus Committee did not proceed until it was stated to them that remonstrance was ineffectual. We seem then by the very passage which you have quoted, to be directed to go on to our Lord's other words (v. 17), *εἰπὲ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ*.

With regard to the particular measure, we are not responsible for its selection; like most half measures, it pleases no party, except the middle party which originated it: we accepted it only because it answered the end of warning the rest of the Church, and especially young men. If they will not take the warning, it rests with them; we have given it, and so 'their blood is upon their own heads, we are clean' (Ezek. xxxiii. 1-6). We think that our proceeding was the truest charity both towards Dr. Hampden and the Church; that however will be known on that day 'when the secrets of all hearts are revealed.' And to that day we would reverentially appeal, as to our great reluctance to take the course we did, and our general proceedings in it. I say general, in order not to seem to arrogate exemption from human infirmity, or to imply that any course of action could be altogether pure in God's sight.

An opinion, signed by the Attorney-General and Dr. Lushington, was taken as to the legality and effect of the vote of Convocation, and it was strongly in favour of Dr. Hampden's supporters. Nothing, however, came of it, and Hampden submitted to the statute during his tenure of the chair. He preached sermons on the subject of the Atonement which would reassure the Low Church party, and he joined them in attacking the Tractarians when opportunity offered. In 1842 a considerable change had taken place in the composition or opinions of the Hebdomadal Board; the feeling against the Tractarians ran high, and an effort was made to abrogate the statute of 1836. A proposal to this effect was carried in the Hebdomadal Board, although without the sanction of Dr. Wynter, the Vice-Chancellor, who said that he 'disapproved of the measure as an act of inconsistency in itself, and not called for by any change of circumstances.' The proposal was rejected by a large majority in Convocation on June 7, 1842.

Pusey explained his own relations to the Hampden controversy—the motives which had animated him, the hopes which it had in the end fostered—in a letter to Tholuck.

E. B. P. TO DR. THOLUCK.

Christ Church, March 6, 1837.

MY DEAR FRIEND,

I must own that in writing to you about our controversy I had another motive beside your sympathy: I thought namely that you would probably be disposed against 'persecution' and think our strong measures such; and then your opinions come back again here, and strengthen liberal views in this country, so I wished you to have fuller materials to judge. I can easily conceive how to you, in Germany, much of our 'Polemik' must appear petty. But you must recollect our circumstances and position. We had not to dispute a point, or show whence the mischief arose, but we had to give the alarm and to cry 'Fire'; if people took the warning and ran to extinguish the fire, the end was secured. In our present state it was enough to show that Dr. H[ampden's] system, as a system, went counter to that of the Articles, to show the leprous spot, and warn people to flee the infection. . . .

England and Germany are, in this respect, in a different state, that in England almost every one of the clergy wishes to be sound. Many idolize indeed the Reformers, and make them the Church; but still the appeal lies *out* of themselves: there is reference almost everywhere to a certain standard of faith, beyond private judgement: they do not set up 'each what is right in his own eyes,' however uncompromisingly they maintain the maxim that every one has a right so to do; and this is a basis of good Church principles, even though, for the present, many may be wrong in its application. This tendency has been much strengthened by the H[ampden] controversy: people have been made to *act* upon a principle, and so (as all action does) have been strengthened in their views to a degree which no teaching of principles could have done. Could something of the same kind have been done at the appearance of the 'Fragments'¹ or any other of those works, Rationalism, I think, might never have gained a head among you.

The present looks prosperously: the Ministry are apparently alarmed at the rising energy of the Church, and the Bishops who have been recommended to the Capituli to elect have been respectable men; for the Chapters have the power to refuse to elect, and some have prepared themselves to refuse and incur the penalties: but I hardly suppose that any great good can be effected without suffering. Was it ever? Meanwhile, however, troops are gathering: people whom one would least have expected are coming to Catholic views, and leaving the narrowness of the so-called Evangelic party; or, often, adding to their previous warmth and energy the depth and reverence which belong to the old Church's view of the Incarnation,

¹ 'i. e. the Wolfenbüttel Fragments.'

connected with the Sacraments. Young men are, as you would suppose, readily kindled by them, and our only fear is, can anything be lasting that spreads so rapidly? Did ever anything grow quickly (except amid persecution) and abide? Yet, on the other hand, everything in this day seems, as you said, to betoken a gigantic struggle, so there will be enough to mature men hereafter, enough of biting frosts to check over-luxuriance; and now God seems to be allowing men to pledge themselves to things they know not how great, and when the time comes for demanding this pledge, He, we trust, will give them the strength they will need: 'As is thy day, so shall thy strength be.' . . .

God preserve you and bless you, now and ever, in all things.

Ever your very affectionate friend,

E. B. PUSEY.

It is interesting to notice what estimate Newman was forming of Pusey's aims and character amidst all this painful controversy. Writing to a friend on April 9, 1836, he says:—

'If you knew my friend Dr. Pusey as well as I do—nay, as well as those generally who come tolerably near him—you would say, I am sure, that never was a man in this world on whom one should feel more tempted to bestow a name which belongs only to God's servants departed, the name of a saint. Never a man who happened unconsciously to show what many more (so be it!) have within them, entire and absolute surrender of himself, in thought, word, and deed, to God's will. And this being so, I shall battle for him when his treatise [on *Erasmism*] is attacked, and by whomsoever¹.'

Before leaving the Hampden controversy, and in view of the great difficulty of appreciating at the present day its justifying circumstances, it may be well to quote Dean Church's valuable judgment on the matter:—

'We are a long way from those days in time, and still more in habits and sentiment; and a manifold and varied experience has taught most of us some lessons against impatience and violent measures. But if we put ourselves back equitably into the ways of thinking prevalent then, the excitement about Dr. Hampden will not seem so unreasonable or so unjustifiable as it is sometimes called to be. The University legislation, indeed, to which it led us poor and petty, doing small and annoying things, because the University rulers dared not commit themselves to definite changes.

¹ Newman's 'Letters,' ii. 192.

But, in the first place, the provocation was great on the part of the Government in putting into the chief theological chair an unwelcome man, who could only save his orthodoxy by making his speculations mean next to nothing—whose *primâ facie* unguarded and startling statements were resolved into truisms put in a grand and obscure form. And in the next place, it was assumed in those days to be the most natural and obvious thing in the world to condemn unsound doctrine, and to exclude unsound teachers. The principle was accepted as indisputable, however slack might have been in recent times the application of it. That it was accepted, not on one side only, but on all, was soon to be shown by the subsequent course of events. No one suffered more severely and more persistently from its application than the Tractarians; no one was more ready to apply it to them than Dr. Hampden with his friends; no one approved and encouraged its vigorous enforcement against them more than Dr. Whately. The idle distinction set up, that they [the Tractarians] were not merely unsound but dishonest, was a mere insolent pretext to save trouble in argument, to heighten the charge against them; no one could seriously doubt that they wrote in good faith as much as Dr. Whately or Dr. Faussett. But unless acts like Dr. Pusey's suspension and the long proscription that went on for years after it, were mere instances of vindictive retaliation, the reproach of persecution must be shared by all parties then, and by none more than by the party which in general terms most denounced it. Those who think the Hampden agitation unique in its injustice, ought to ask themselves what their party would have done if at any time between 1836 and 1843 Mr. Newman had been placed in Dr. Hampden's seat¹.

¹ Church's 'Oxford Movement,' pp. 151 sq.

CHAPTER XVII.

ON SACRILEGE—ON PRAYER—ON CATHEDRAL REFORM—
OLD TESTAMENT STUDIES—THE MINISTRY OF THE
PRIESTHOOD—CATHOLIC PRINCIPLES—CAMBRIDGE
VISITORS—IMPRESSIONS OF OXFORD.

1836.

PUSEY was much fatigued by the labours of the Hampden controversy in addition to his daily burden of work and correspondence. He seems to have had an 'attack of numbness' in one of his arms during the Easter Vacation, which occasioned some anxiety to those about him. The vacation—so to call it—had been passed partly at Grosvenor Square and partly at Fairford; and during it, or soon after, a difference of opinion appears to have arisen between himself and his eldest brother on the ecclesiastical questions that were before Parliament.

The Commission appointed by Sir Robert Peel's Administration to enquire into the ecclesiastical condition of the Church of England and into the state of cathedral and collegiate revenues had presented a first Report, and the Archbishop of Canterbury had brought into the House of Lords a Bill to give effect to the recommendations of the commissioners respecting pluralities and non-residence. Besides this, two Bills were introduced into the House of Commons by Lord John Russell; one to remodel the English bishoprics in respect of extent and income, and a second to suppress cathedral and collegiate preferments and sinecure benefices. That these Bills were directed

against very real abuses admits of no doubt; but there was a great deal to be said against many of the provisions of the proposed remedy, as well as against the agencies which were providing it. Mr. Philip Pusey, however, deeply impressed with the necessity of reform in respect of the temporalities of the Church, was, at least in the main, supporting Lord John Russell: and this led to a somewhat warm difference of opinion between the brothers. In 1832 Pusey, who had not yet emerged from the political liberalism of his early life, wrote of his elder brother, when a candidate for the representation of Berkshire, as 'a good constitutional Tory.' Now it seemed that they had changed sides. A remonstrance addressed to his brother Philip produced the following reply:—

PHILIP PUSEY TO E. B. P.

St. John's Wood, June 29, 1836.

I am obliged to you for your full and interesting statement of the theological views which you entertain in common with so many superior men at Oxford. Their practical effect on the mind is shown, I think, excellently in Mr. Dodsworth, whose chapel I have for some time constantly attended. With regard to ecclesiastical politics, I think you are precipitate in your reasoning when you insist upon applying the term of sacrilege to the conduct of those who take a different view of them from yourself. The tenure of the property must be considered surely before we condemn in so unqualified a manner those who say they have a right to dispose of it. If all withdrawal of funds from a sacred purpose be sacrilege, then it was sacrilege in Lord Stanley to withdraw the Irish Church rates from the Church of Ireland, and sacrilege again to withdraw the assistance of the Government from the English missionaries in Canada. The tenure of those funds was different, you will say: they were of a disposable nature, and these are inalienable. That, however, is the whole question between us—resting on grounds of civil equity as well as on religious considerations. I will not discuss them with you, and there would be no end gained by doing so.

As regards Catholics and Lutherans, I believe there is a preponderance of good over evil in their creeds and practice, and we must be slow, I should say, to condemn them, even where we are sure they are in error.

E. B. P. TO PHILIP PUSEY, ESQ., M.P.

Christ Church, July 1, 1836.

I agree with you that it is useless for us to discuss principles; you have adopted a principle which will carry you further (if you live

and are continued in Parliament) than you are yet aware, or than I have happened to hear you avow, even to the destruction of your own Church, as far as man can destroy it. I should not have reverted to the subject but that you seemed to hold it out 'in terrorem' that we should not be allowed to maintain our own spiritual rights unless we gave up to the State our temporal subsistence, or, still more, the patrimony which we have received in trust to use ourselves to the service of Almighty God, and to hand down to our successors to be so used. I think that the more we concede either way the more encroaching the State will be.

I would, however, explain what I mean by sacrilege: 'taking away money which has been consecrated to the service of Almighty God.' If the State pleased now to take away the property of the Church from the Church and to give it to the Romish Church, I should not call this 'sacrilege,' although I should hold it as very displeasing to God; but still it leaves it to a Church, although many of the doctrines of that Church are corrupted. Again, I regard the cessation of the assistance of Government from the propagation of the Gospel in Canada, at this time, ungodly, although it was intended originally to cease whenever the colonies could provide for themselves. I regard it as ungodly because the sum was needed, and it argued a profane spirit to take away this as a saving and then spend far more on a National Gallery of pictures. Still, what had been dedicated to God was given to Him, so there was no sacrilege, any more than if I were to withdraw my subscription from the S.P.C.K., although I should account my doing so, and purchasing a print with the money, an ungodly deed.

Lord Stanley's withdrawal of the Irish Church rates I do regard as sacrilege, although in him it excited no surprise, for at that time he was joined, apparently against his better feelings, with a sacrilegious party. However, the Church rates were abolished to save the money, or rather to put a canker into the money-chests of the Protestant landlords; and for this ten bishoprics, with many parishes, which our forefathers formed, and sacrificed their wealth to form, for God's honour, are confiscated in order to increase the mammon of the men of this day. Let who will have connived at, or not resisted, this measure, it was sacrilege.

But on your plan there could be no such sin as sacrilege. . . . If what we give for the endowment of a Church may be resumed and secularized, so may the ornaments of the Church itself: they might melt down our plate and tell us that the Apostolic Churches doubtless had none (although I would not affirm this); and if it may be resumed by the State, then it would no longer be sacrilege to take it, even while it was left to the Church, since it cannot depend upon the State to make an act a sin or not.

With regard to the Lutherans and Romanists, while Lutheranism existed the good, I trust, preponderated over the bad, although it degenerated and so was destroyed; there is now no, or scarcely any,

such thing in Prussia—at least, it is a small proscribed sect, and there is, I believe, but little elsewhere.

I respect Lutheranism for having retained the high doctrine of the Sacraments, although one error therein falsified their theology and so led to its corruption and destruction. As for Romanism, it also has a great deal of truth in its system, but few who believe it; where it is believed I should expect it to survive all mere Protestantism, anything, i.e., but our own Church and Sweden, and I should think that Romanism would probably eat up dissent in the country. In Edinburgh alone there are a hundred proselytes made every year from Presbyterianism; not one in the whole of Scotland from our Church.

I have derived great pleasure lately from a visit from a young German theologian, who speaks of a decided feeling and longing after more of Church principles than they now have. Oh for something like a return to Catholicity among Protestants!

The correspondence did not end here; but the only remaining letter which has yet been found illustrates Pusey's habit of giving a practical religious turn to everything that occurred:—

E. B. P. TO PHILIP PUSEY, ESQ., M.P.

[July 28, 1836.]

I am glad that you have taken my letter, as it was meant, kindly though earnestly. At our age people unhappily but seldom hear truth, and when in consequence of situation a person does hear it, it is generally mixed up with so much bitterness and untruth that it is worse than useless.

My object in writing was to press the use of prayer, or, if you used it for these occasions also, more earnest and more humble use of it; and I would just say a few more words upon it, since this is one of the eternal subjects upon which I would gladly speak. . . .

1. It is often at the outset very perplexing to persons to observe how different persons, whom they suppose equally to make use of prayer, come to opposite results: this has been a temptation to many to neglect prayer altogether, to others to confine it to matters of personal conduct (that one should act from right motives, to the best of one's judgement, honestly, without praying that that judgement should be enlightened). Others, as Scott ('Force of Truth'), have inferred that because they have used prayer, therefore the result to which they have come must be right. In the recent instance, as Sir R. Peel never goes down to the House (certainly on any important question) without praying to God for direction, you have alike used prayer, and come to opposite results. It is not sufficient then to use prayer. To take Scott's case: he was strongly convinced that the doctrine (I think) of final perseverance would be a great blessing to the earnest-minded of

his congregation ; and so he set himself to examine the New Testament (as he almost acknowledges) with a manifest and strong bias, though with the use of prayer. Now, we should easily see that if he arrived at the conclusion at which he wished, there was no evidence that he was led to it by God ; that he did not approach it in a sufficiently teachable spirit ; that he wished to be confirmed in his own views, not to learn or be taught of God. And something of this kind most of us probably may have observed in ourselves, viz. that in praying to God we had some sort of mental reservation, and that while we prayed for His guidance there was some feeling lurking at the bottom of our hearts that we were sure that we were right, i.e. in plain terms that we did not want God's guidance any more to lead us into truth, but only to enable us to act rightly in it.

2. Prayer should be persevering indeed, but especially in the beginning of a course of action and of forming a line of opinions, and so accompany us continually. For if we delay it until after we have begun our line of action or taken up our opinions, or until these are any way ripened or formed, then if we use prayer it may be that we are too late. We have been acting wrongly in depending thus far upon ourselves, and it may be that God may think fit to leave us to the punishment of our own presumption, and by not helping us in this case to teach either ourselves or other beings more entire dependence upon Him. At all events (for I do not mean that we should despair of guidance if we have acted thus) it requires a much stronger exertion of faith, much more self-denial—for it may be that we shall be required to give up our plan of action or opinions, which is at all times a hard trial to the flesh—and unless we are ready to give them up, if it be God's will, we are not submitting to God's teaching, or praying in faith, and therefore cannot expect to be heard. Not as if we were always to be praying about first principles or doubting about them : e.g. if I were now to write about the Holy Trinity I should not pray to be guided into truth with regard to the fundamentals of this doctrine, for this I am satisfied that the Universal Church, and so myself, already has ; but whatever I hold to be matter of enquiry or of doubt, this, I think, ought to be made the subject of prayer from the very moment one first enters upon it, and even then one may often suffer from a wrong bias one has previously received through the former neglect of prayer. And so I should fear that many good men are now suffering from the former neglect of prayer, or rather it is a comfort to think that to this may be owing our miserably low standard in many respects (e.g. duelling, evil-speaking, self-opinion), and that hereafter, by a more earnest and earlier use of prayer, the character of the Christian world may be heightened.

3. It frequently happens that some collateral defect is preventing our being guided into truth, even while we pray for it ; i.e. that we are, from other defects against which we have not sufficiently struggled, unworthy of being God's instrument for good, or are opposing the

influences which we pray for. We are unconsciously influenced by other motives and principles than those which we put prominently to ourselves, and so are in fact not praying aright—not against the evil dispositions yet remaining in us, which are the hindrances of God's blessing—not completely enough; we are asking for one blessing when we ought to be asking for many: and so it may be that God denies the one which we ask, that, looking why we have it not, we may learn more of ourselves and what we ought to ask for. Take, e.g., Cranmer's vacillations, Laud's arbitrariness: both were holy and good men, both, I doubt not, prayed most earnestly to be directed, both were of eminent service, yet were the benefits of which they might otherwise have been the instruments much diminished and their own characters compromised, probably by want of sufficient watchfulness, not over their general conduct, but over some secret springs which were sending up bitter waters under it. Every age has its peculiar evil tendencies, every individual his own plague; some of those of our age are love of display, of popularity (i.e. the praise of men), self-confidence, expediency, want of sincerity, tolerance of evil, shallow notions about God and His truth, and these probably have their influence in their degree over most of us; we are breathing an infected atmosphere—our own plagues we each of us, I hope; know; and by correcting these more earnestly we are, I trust, in the way of being guided more completely into that truth which as yet is hid from us. I was much struck in yesterday morning's lesson (often as one has read it), by the absoluteness and fullness of the promise, with the earnest of the condition, 'If ye abide in Me and My words abide in you, ye shall ask what ye will, and it shall be done unto you': which modern unbelief, because Christ's words do not abide in them, interprets of miraculous powers only: and so again it is striking how very peremptorily God says that deficiency of faith shall prevent our receiving anything. 'Let not that man think that he shall receive anything of the Lord.' 'Ye ask and have not, because ye ask amiss.'

May God teach us what to ask and how to ask it, and give us His Spirit to ask early and fervently and perseveringly, and take away everything in us which may prevent all our prayers being heard.

On July 20th a meeting of members of the cathedral bodies was held for defensive purposes in the Chapter-house of St. Paul's Cathedral. Mr. Sydney Smith, whose interest in the subject was notorious, was in the chair, as being Canon in residence. Three Deans and twenty-nine Canons were present. Pusey had attended an earlier meeting at St. Paul's on July 8th; he then went to stay at Clapham with the Rev. B. Harrison's father, and there met Dr. Dealtry, who suggested that he should draw up a petition

to the House of Lords against Lord John Russell's Bill for suppressing many offices in the cathedrals, and diverting their revenues to other purposes. Pusey drew up a petition of twenty-four paragraphs, in which he repeated the reasons for preserving the cathedrals which he had urged in his work on Cathedral Institutions. If the cathedrals were not as useful to the Church as they might have been, it was because patrons had not been careful to make good appointments to them: they had been, and might be again, the homes of solid learning, which, if less calculated to command public notice, involved more labour than parochial work, and was not less useful to the Church.

This petition, marked by the redundant earnestness and sustained intensity which were his characteristics, Pusey read to the meeting on the 20th. It would be interesting to know what the chairman thought of it: the meeting certainly thought very well of it, and had it lithographed for circulation in the several Chapters of England and Wales. On the 25th of July Lord John Russell announced that the Bill was withdrawn. This was partly due to the Radical opposition, which objected to it as not going far enough. But it was also in part the work of the religious resistance to which Pusey had powerfully contributed. 'The respite,' wrote Archdeacon Hoare to Pusey, 'has been obtained for us, I think, by the stir you enabled us to make towards the close of the last session.'

That it was only a respite Pusey knew full well; and indeed he was too little satisfied with the existing state of things in cathedrals not to wish for well-considered changes, devised, not in the interests of political adventurers, but in those of the religion and Church of Christ. He wrote a long letter to Archdeacon Hoare about the principles on which Cathedral Reform should be conducted. Of these principles, the leading one was respect for the regulations of the founders.

'The only case,' he contended, 'in which it has ever been thought right to alter the regulations of the founder is when the purposes he contemplated have ceased to exist.'

If property had been left to a corrupt Church, it still had been left to promote God's service, and it could not be devoted to other purposes without sin. It would indeed be as reasonable to confiscate a Professorship of Astronomy, because the Professor taught differently from the founder who lived when the Ptolemaic system was taken for granted: the founder desired to have astronomy taught. But with such reasonable reserves the principle held good. The will of the founders is a trust, and our necessities do not warrant us in ignoring it. Pusey warns modern Church reformers against taking credit to themselves for anxiety to promote God's kingdom, while sacrificing to Him nothing but that which was not their own. But, premising this, Pusey had many and extensive reforms in cathedrals at heart. All non-residentiaries should reside. If necessary, property within the cathedrals should be redistributed. Parishes in which cathedrals held tithes should be well endowed. Cathedral towns should have ample spiritual provision made for them, and in a degree, and according to circumstances, all parishes in a diocese should have some claim on the cathedral funds; but this claim would necessarily be very limited. Pusey would insist on the integrity of the cathedrals, unless a canonry or canonries had to be sunk to make spiritual provision for places where the cathedral held tithes. Deaneries and canonries should be devoted to the promotion of sound religious learning. And in any redistribution of property regard should be had to the claims of the diocese or county for which the endowment was originally devised: 'the funds of Devonshire should not be employed for Lancashire, or of Durham for Staffordshire.' The Church would be stronger at this moment in some parts of the country if the Ecclesiastical Commissioners could have kept this last principle constantly in view.

Reviewing the question some weeks later, Pusey writes to Keble:—

‘October 13, 1836.

‘Whatever be the cause, I do think that the parochial clergy are much to blame for their silence about these Bills. The Cathedral clergy

remained silent too long. But they had the excuse that they appeared to be interested parties. And it has been (rightly or wrongly) the line taken by the clergy to keep silence on subjects which affected their own interests. But the parochial clergy would have appeared as persons acting rather against their interests, inasmuch as some of them might have their share of the spoils. But certainly I did see cases in which they took it for granted that the Chapters were to be despoiled, and only looked for their portion of the prey. Thus even — applied for their slice of the Windsor property. Now, if the body of parochial clergy are silent, and others are forestalling the slaughter, and the poor Chapters have an ill-name, and the Conservatives are pressing for measures which will strengthen (the Church and) themselves, and people see that there is so much that might be done with their funds and that, on account of the appointments, so little is done with them now,—it requires firmer minds than the end of the last century or the beginning of this seems to have trained, either in Church or State, to stand apparently alone against all this. And if those who were trained in more nerving days wish the battle not to be lost, they must volunteer and not leave their generals to look about and rally *them*, or fight without them.'

But Church Reform was only the *πρόπαρα* of Pusey's life during the Long Vacation of 1836. The main work which he set himself to do was to write a set of supplementary lectures for his Hebrew pupils on the types and prophecies of the Old Testament. He worked hard at this during July and August, even though the 'Library of the Fathers' was presenting itself to him as an object with paramount claims upon his time.

'I have not yet got through the types and prophecies of the Pentateuch,' he writes to Harrison on September 15, 'or, rather, I am but just commencing the types of the ritual, so that I hardly suppose that during the vacation I shall get beyond the Pentateuch. And then I shall have, if possible, to prepare lectures for the next term, even if I have enough for this.'

These lectures on types and prophecies were never published; their author, it seems, was never sufficiently well satisfied with them, and they only exist in a fragmentary and imperfect form among his papers. But the labour of writing them was not lost. Some of the thoughts in them survive in his last sermon on Prophecy preached in 1878 before the University; and they enabled Pusey to make the very interesting addition on the types of Holy Baptism

which appeared in the second edition of the tract on that subject¹. The lectures were not so well attended as Pusey had hoped: twenty-nine seems to have been the total number of listeners at the beginning of term. But they interested older people at a distance.

'I want,' wrote Keble in November, 'to hear your lectures on types and prophecies, and whether Jeffreys is right in saying that you are *always* against a *double sense*.' 'I fear,' replied Pusey, 'that I must have misled my former pupils by not having myself adequate notions of types, although what I have been gradually expanding for a good many years. What I think Jeffreys alludes to is my denying any typical basis to such places as Ps. ii, xlv, and to those parts of Is. xl—end which relate to our Lord, contrary to those modern notions which say, This psalm was first fulfilled in David, then in Christ. But I think this was intended to be confined to particular places. . . . I cannot give any principle in a few words, for I should admit a typical sense in "the seed of the woman," "in thy seed shall all nations, &c.," although not where the dignity of our Lord is plainly spoken of, nor again in Is. liii.'

Side by side with these serious literary undertakings, which more and more deeply engrossed him, and apart from his interest in Church Reform, he carried on already correspondence enough to have exhausted the energies of any ordinary man. A now well-known clergyman, the Rev. J. Fuller Russell, was in the year 1836 an undergraduate at Cambridge, and wrote Pusey a series of questions about subjects which the Church movement was bringing into prominence. Cambridge was supposed to be less open to Church influences than Oxford. The studies of the place were not so wide as they have since become; there was at any rate an absence of that general philosophical training which Oxford men associated with Aristotle's *Ethics* and the works of Bishop Butler; and there was also the active influence of the Rev. C. Simeon's vigorous personality and sincere, if somewhat narrow, piety. Still, the principles which were now rapidly winning the allegiance of the best intellectual and moral life of Oxford were making way here and there among younger Cambridge men. Mr. Russell's questions illustrate the interest that had been

¹ Cf. 'Tracts for the Times,' No. 67, 2nd ed., pp. 301 sqq.

aroused, and Pusey's answer might well have been that of a man who had nothing to do but write letters.

E. B. P. TO J. F. RUSSELL, ESQ.

Christ Church, Dec. 10, 1836.

I take the first moment of leisure to attempt to answer your questions, and can assure you that I am always glad (when I have leisure) to answer, as I can, any practical difficulties which may occur to younger men.

(1) It is certainly a privilege to be confirmed. Confirmation is not simply the taking upon oneself the vows made for one in infancy, but also a channel of grace through the ordinance of God. It, as well as Orders, differs from the two great Sacraments in that these directly unite us with Christ ; but both it and Orders are means of grace to the worthy receiver. The antient Church administered confirmation almost as a part of baptism, to the adult as to the infant, when a Bishop was at hand ; otherwise the acts were separated. Our Church at the end of the office for adult baptism says that it 'is expedient that every person, thus baptized, should be confirmed by the Bishop, as soon as conveniently may be.' Our Church also certainly contemplates that persons should be confirmed, even after having been admitted to the Communion, if on any ground they should have been admitted to the Communion before ; because confirmation is a privilege from which a person is not to be excluded.

(2) In Absolution, the contrast is not between 'declaratory' and 'ministerial,' but between 'ministerial' and 'judicial.' It is this last which the Church of Rome holds and we do not. It is remarkable that we have in our service the three forms : Declaratory (daily service), Precatory (Communion service), and that which puts the 'ministerial' most prominently (Visitation of the Sick). Yet these are but three several forms of doing the same act. 'It is all one,' says Bishop Sparrow, '*Rationale of Common Prayer*,' p. 15, 'as to the remission of sins in the penitent, whether the priest absolves him after this form : "Almighty God, Who hath given me and all priests power to pronounce pardon to the penitent, *He pardons you*:" or thus, "By virtue of a commission granted to me from God, *I absolve you*;" or lastly, "God pardon you," viz. by me His servant according to His promise, "Whose sins ye remit, they are remitted." All these are but several expressions of the same thing, and are effectual to the penitent, by virtue of that commission mentioned St. John xx, which commission in two of these forms is expressed, and in the last, viz. that at the Communion, is sufficiently implied and supposed.

The *Ministerialness* of the act consists in that it has pleased God that the absolution should be conveyed through a minister, as expressed by the Greek Church (ap. Bp. Sparrow) : 'Almighty God, pardon you by me His unworthy servant,' or 'Lord, pardon him, for Thou hast

said, "Whose sins, &c." sometimes expressing, always including, God's commission.' But we regard the priest as exercising simply a ministerial, not a *judicial* act, as the Romanist. Again, the difference of absolution not being a sacrament is very great: to the Romanist it is a second baptism; with us it is an earnest of God's future mercy, in that if we be truly and heartily penitent, He allows us to partake of it, but it is not plenary as in baptism. There are, of course, many other points connected with it wherein we differ from Rome, as the *necessity* of particular confession, the meaning of satisfaction, &c.

(3) The objection as to the Ordination Service of Edward VI. and all other objections have been fully answered by Courayer, a French Romanist, in several works: (1) 'Dissertation sur la validité des Ordinations des Anglois,' (2) 'Défense de la Dissertation,' (3) 'Supplément aux deux Ouvrages faits pour la défense,' &c. I think the first has been translated. There is also a good work by Mason (Archdeacon), 'Defence of the English Church¹.' It is true that in Edward the Sixth's book the name of the office to which the persons were ordained was omitted. The words addressed to the priest ran, 'Receive the Holy Ghost. Whosoever sins,' &c.; but it is absurd to found any argument upon it. The words were never thought essential, especially since it is not one of the two Sacraments, and so the words are not our Lord's; and it would be ridiculous, if it had not been so miserably dishonest, inasmuch as the Roman form is the very same thus far as that of Edward VI. Other Romanists who have admitted the validity of our Orders are mentioned by Courayer and Mr. Palmer in his 'Origines Liturgicæ.'

(4) Our Church receives the four first Councils as being real *Universal* or Catholic Councils. The Bishops therein assembled bore witness to the faith which they had received from their predecessors, and so from the Apostles. The 'General Councils' to which our Art. XXI. objects are what are popularly so called, and are asserted to be such by the Romanists, but are not so. A real General or Universal Council, we believe, could not err, because of our Lord's promise that He would be always with His Church. The Romanists have erred in applying this promise to particular Councils, or Councils held in conjunction with the Pope. (You may find some useful information in Mr. Perceval's recent book 'On the Roman Schism.') To say that 'we are bound by them *because* they declare the faith which *we* acknowledge,' would plainly be to say that we are not bound by them at all; for we should then accept [them] on our own authority, because they fell in with our views. Tradition has been so miserably broken that on many points we could not have a General Council now, yet on any new heresy we might; e.g. were it necessary to declare that 'there are *doctrines* in Scripture besides facts,' the whole Christian world could give witness

¹ 'Vindication of the Church of England and of the Lawful Ministry there-

of,' by Francis Mason, B.D., ed. Lindsay. London, 1728.

that they had so learned from their forefathers, and so on; and this would in itself be valid, inasmuch as it would establish an universal tradition. So again against a modern sect which denies 'a day of judgement'; the Church has always been taught so to interpret Holy Scripture, and since this is universal it must have come from the Apostles. So again 'Baptismal regeneration,' since it can be proved that the other tradition is recent, reaching up only to Zwingli.

(5) You will find Mr. Keble's opinions very clearly stated at the bottom of p. 30¹. One thing which he wishes to inculcate is, that our knowledge that Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation is not derived from Holy Scripture itself, nor from the reason of the thing, but from tradition. You will find some valuable observations on the subject of tradition in Bishop Beveridge's 'Introduction to the Canons,' which I quoted in my answer to the 'Pope's Pastoral' (reprinted in 'Tracts for the Times,' at end of preface to vol. 3), and in the edition of Vincentius now coming out.

Having now answered your questions, which I have been glad to do, while I express my satisfaction at the growth of Catholic principles everywhere in our Church, I may add that it is not unmixed with anxiety. Not that I see anything in your letter to cause it, but that as soon as a set of views becomes popular there is danger lest they should be taken up abstractedly, or as a set of notions, or a beautiful theory: not practically. They are a precious deposit, and on that account the warning can never be misplaced, to take heed how we hold it, lest the holding it should prove rather a condemnation. I do trust that God's Holy Spirit, Who is at this time awakening men everywhere so rapidly and so suddenly to a sense of the importance of these truths, will carry on this His work, and that we shall not grieve Him; but for this there is need of much watchfulness, lest we substitute possession of these truths for the use of them. They must be always thought of reverently as a talent of which we must give account; and they are privileges so high that, except by continual thankfulness for them and growth under them, men would come to substitute names for things. Take e.g. 'Apostolic succession';—what is this but to say that we have a privilege which scarcely any other body of Christians has in the West, which is freed from the corruptions of Rome. Or, again, if we speak of it with reference to Dissenters, with what real sorrow we ought to feel their loss, and with what humility our own privileges. I do not mean that we should force ourselves to feel this; but if we speak of them we should do it with reverent earnestness, and try not to do so without the consciousness of their greatness. Another corrective is, acting upon them: fasting (as health permits), self-denial, earnest intercessory prayer, when we would gladly follow some other wishes of our own; obedience and respect for authority (even when it goes against our own views, if not against conscience), respectful or not

¹ Sermon on Primitive Tradition.

disrespectful mention of those placed in authority,—will help to realize these views to us, and may, we may trust, bring down the blessing of Almighty God, that He may more and more realize them in us.

With every good wish and prayer, I remain,

Yours faithfully,

E. B. PUSEY.

Mr. Russell was already engaged in forming a catena of English Church writers since the Reformation on the subject of Church authority in relation to Holy Scripture. Pusey offered to subscribe to it, although he had to tell Mr. Russell that 'Mr. Newman has a catena almost ready on the same subject.' Mr. Russell soon became a correspondent of Pusey's.

'You will be glad to hear,' he writes, 'that Catholicism is gradually gaining ground at Cambridge, although it meets with a fierce opposition in some quarters of our University. Mr. Carus, who has succeeded Mr. Simeon as the leader of a certain party at Cambridge, has embraced the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, and inculcates it at his parties.'

All, however, was not sunshine. *The Christian Advocate* had intended to attack Keble's sermon on Primitive Tradition. Mr. Russell's own brother had attacked Newman's tract on 'The Introduction of Rationalistic Principles into Religion¹.' Newman had headed one of his pages 'The Atonement not a manifestation of God's Justice,' meaning not that it did not exhibit God's justice, but that it did not make the reasons for its being justice perfectly intelligible to man. The phrase was, however, misunderstood, and made the ground of an attack on the writer.

'What Newman says,' writes Pusey to Mr. Russell, 'is so manifestly directed against those who speak as if they understood the whole mystery of man's redemption, and [who] bring [down] not *one* of its ends, but *Its end* (!), as they say, to the level of everyday common sense, and talk familiarly of the counsels of God therein, as if it was a matter which lay on the very surface of things, that I cannot acquit your brother of very culpable prejudice or carelessness. It seems to me quite a ground why he should recall his pamphlet; which, however, authors very rarely do. But "Semi-Arianism" is not a word to be

¹ 'Tracts for the Times,' No. 73.

banded about carelessly. I do not object to strong terms : we have been obliged to use them. But I doubt Dr. H[ampden]'s statements being called Socinian, however they might lead to it. With all kind feeling to your brother, I think that he has been grievously wrong in this matter.'

Oxford became a place of pilgrimage in the eyes of young Cambridge Churchmen, and in writing to a friend Mr. Russell has left an account of his own visit to it in the autumn of 1837. He was accompanied by the Rev. W. J. Irons, who was at that time 'boldly proclaiming true principles and securing an overflowing congregation' in Walworth.

J. F. RUSSELL, ESQ., TO A FRIEND.

Nov. 18, 1837.

... How you will envy me when you hear that I have just returned from a most delightful visit to Oxford. Irons and I left London at ten o'clock on Monday, and reached the University about five. On Tuesday morning I was dressed by eight, and hastened down to Oriel, which stands in a narrow street, facing great St. Mary's. Having surveyed the great court, I retraced my steps, and finding that great St. Mary's Church was open, I entered. An open screen, surmounted by the organ, separated the nave from the chancel. I looked through the glass doors and beheld Newman kneeling before the altar with his face towards it. A few people were kneeling with him : this was his regular morning service. I returned to Queen's, where one Pocock¹ (a man of note and worth in the University) met us at breakfast. We soon completed our repast, and Irons and I hastened to Christ Church. I left my card at Linwood's, and Irons was soon closeted with Dr. Pusey. Irons rejoined me about two, and said that Pusey had enquired about me and would see me at three. At three, accordingly, we found ourselves in the innermost cell, the central chamber of the 'Popery of the kingdom.' I should say, first, that we passed through a hall, and a large room well furnished with books, before we entered the sanctuary. This was a large chamber of some height and nearly square. There were two lofty Gothic windows, at one of which was placed a standing-desk. There were also two or three tables, a sofa, and sundry chairs in the room, all more or less laden with books. The Doctor was seated in an armed and cushioned chair, and received us with much kindness. He is a young-looking man, about my height, very pale and careworn, with a slight impediment in his speech. Irons put some erudite questions to him about the Canons of Nice and the celibacy of the clergy,

¹ [Nicholas Pocock, Michel Fellow of Queen's; B.A. 1834; M.A. 1837. (Rev. J. F. Russell's note.)]

and the Doctor laughed at Irons' plausible argument that, under existing circumstances, it was better for the clergy to marry as fast as possible! Pusey soon alluded to my brother. He said he had received two letters from him, but he thought it useless to argue with him *on paper*. The question at issue between them was a simple matter of fact. I might tell my brother that Mr. Newman never intended to deny that the Atonement satisfied God's justice; and that the very words of the tract [No. 73] could not be wrenched so as to warrant so grave an accusation as my brother's. I said that he had made up his mind that the words of the heading of the passage—'the Atonement not an exhibition¹ of God's Justice' [p. 29], must be taken as an epitome of the contents of the page. Pusey said that the emphasis ought to be laid on the word 'exhibition,' and that he was sorry that more care had not been taken with the *heading* so as to avoid its being misunderstood. The bell of Christ Church now struck four, and Pusey put on his surplice, and we followed him into the cathedral. Before we parted he invited us both to dine with him on the following day. Service ended we returned to Queen's, and presently dined at the Fellows' table. Dinner over we adjourned to the 'Common-room,' and sat there until nine. The talk naturally fell upon Pusey, &c. It was allowed that the Doctor and Newman *governed the University*, and that nothing could withstand the influence of themselves and their friends. Every man of talent who during the last six years has come to Oxford has joined Newman, and when he preaches at St. Mary's (on every Sunday afternoon) all the men of talent in the University come to hear him, although at the loss of their dinner. His triumph over the *mental* empire of Oxford was said to be complete! Pusey is considered the great benefactor of *Oxford*; he supports five divinity students in his own house, and his benefactions to the poor are very great. He had preached a sermon (to a crowded congregation) in St. Mary's Church, on the 5th November², which had occasioned immense excitement, and he was engaged to preach on the two following Sundays. It was said that he possessed an indirect but great influence over the whole clergy of Oxford, and that even those who did not openly profess themselves 'on his side,' were imperceptibly adopting his sentiments. . . . On Wednesday, after breakfast, Irons and I called on Newman. He was seated at a small desk in a comfortable room, stored with books. He is a dark, middle-aged, middle-sized man, with lanky black hair and large spectacles, thin, gentlemanly, and very insinuating. He received us with the greatest kindness, and said he had been invited to meet us at Pusey's, but had so 'grievous a cold' that he feared he could not come. Irons, however, overruled all objections, and when we left him he gave us to understand that we should meet him. The hour of five

¹ Newman's word was 'manifestation.' 'Exhibition' had been Mr. Erskine's word, from whom Newman quotes.

² Nov. 5, 1837: 'Patience and confidence the strength of the Church.' Univ. Sermons, vol. i. sermon ix.

us at Christ Church. When we entered Pusey's sanctum we found him and Harrison [now Archdeacon of Maidstone], Student of Christ Church, by the feeble light of bedchamber-candlestick candle burning over the last sheet of Pusey's fifth of November sermon. Presently an argand lamp threw its mild lustre over the room, and Newman was announced. Pusey seemed delighted to see him. He told me how I liked Oxford. I discoursed on its superiority over Cambridge, and added that it reminded me of a city of the middle ages. We then had a little talk about sundry old customs which were still preserved in the city. Harrison departed with the sermon, and we went into the dining-room. There were two other guests besides ourselves, and we were soon seated at table. Newman was opposite me, at my right, and Pusey at the head of the board. The conversation was chiefly between Irons and Newman (Pusey is a man of few words). It referred to the heresy of Irving and his followers, and Pusey observed that miracles had [might have] been performed by that party, if always considered as the rewards of *personal faith* and wrought in confirmation of any particular and uncatholic views of doctrine. The question how far we receive the authority of the first General Councils was also broached. Newman and Pusey seemed to know less about them than Irons. I suggested that we only received their decisions so far as the great verities of the Faith were concerned, and Newman and Pusey agreed with me. Newman suggested that the distinction to be made between matters of doctrine and matters of discipline was this, i.e. that matters of doctrine are those which have been *universally* received, as are the Trinity, Incarnation, Episcopal Succession, Baptismal Regeneration, and the like. Irons made some observations on the Atonement. He said that every other act of our Saviour's life was, in its own place, of equal value with His last sacrificial act. Newman strongly insisted, on the contrary, that the Atonement was the grand procuring and meritorious cause of our pardon, and quoted sundry texts in proof of it. In reference to the text, 'He died for our sins, and rose again for our justification,' he commented on the errors of those who, resting on the first part of it, 'He died for our sins,' think that their salvation is secure without the Church, forgetting and overlooking altogether the latter clause of the text, 'He rose again for our justification,' that is, He rose that He might send the gift of His Spirit upon His Church, and through her and sacraments, through all ages, dispense the means of grace and justification. Pusey had not gone into the question of the succession, but he thought the only point in it which required guarding against respecting the consecration of Parker, &c. Auricular confession, he feared, was a grace which had been lost to the Church and not to be restored. Presently, after dinner, Dr. Pusey's children came into the room. One climbed Newman's knee and hugged him. Newman put his spectacles on him, and next on his sister, and great was the merriment of the Puseyan progeny. Newman, it is said,

hates ecclesiastical conversation. He writes so much that when in society he seems always inclined to talk on light, amusing subjects. He told them a story of an old woman who had a broomstick which would go to the well, draw water, and do many other things for her; how the old woman got tired of the broomstick, and wishing to destroy it broke it in twain, and how, to the old woman's great chagrin and disappointment, *two* live broomsticks grew from the broken parts of the old one! We quitted Christ Church about nine, highly delighted with our visit. It was esteemed the highest honour which could have been paid us. We left Oxford about half-past twelve on Wednesday night, by the mail, and reached Oxford Street at about five on Thursday morning. Pusey sent Irons a copy of his sermon before he left, so we were the first persons in the kingdom not immediately connected with the Doctor who had it in our possession!

This picture brings before us the weakness as well as the strength of the Movement in those early days. The anxiety to recover forgotten truths and to enable Christianity to encounter its opponents with new courage, which was the animating principle of Newman and Pusey, was naturally, in the case of younger men, mixed up with other interests and feelings. They were fascinated by the Movement itself apart from its objects; by the intellectual enterprise which had created it, and the warm adhesion which it commanded; by the opposition which it provoked, and the skill, courage, and determination with which opponents were encountered. But this could not last. As time goes on work and war become monotonous, and reverses are inevitable in the history of all human effort. Mr. Russell and Mr. Irons were both loyal to the Church movement to the end; but such loyalty is tested when a cause is no longer aided by brilliant powers, or able to command conspicuous success.

CHAPTER XVIII.

THE LIBRARY OF THE FATHERS.

1836.

THE Hampden controversy had many consequences ; but its most important literary result was the creation of 'The Library of the Fathers.' Pusey's mind had been directed in some measure towards the Fathers almost from boyhood. The copy of St. Chrysostom's works which his own father had given him in the year 1824, before he took Holy Orders, had guided and fed his veneration for those great teachers ; and even during the years when German theology and the Hebrew and Arabic languages had largely absorbed his time he had never altogether lost sight of them¹. In his early life, however, the Fathers stood, in his estimation, only on a level with, if not below, modern divines, and he has left on record an account of the considerations by which he was led to recognize their true relative greatness. In spite of the article on 'The Oxford Malig-nants,' Dr. Arnold, while preparing his two sermons on Prophecy, begged Mr. W. A. Greenhill to ask Pusey's advice as to the books he should consult in order to understand the patristic view of the subject. Although compelled to pay a high tribute to the character of Pusey himself, whose assistance he was seeking, Dr. Arnold does not think it inappropriate at the same time to inveigh with his old rancour against 'some of the Newmanites' with whom Pusey was by this time thoroughly identified.

'I really shall be anxious,' wrote Arnold, 'to get Pusey's answer ; and though I do not expect to agree entirely with any of the books

¹ 'Theology of Germany,' ii. p. 74.

which he may name, yet I should probably agree with them more than he imagines, and I should certainly read them with no purpose or feeling of controversy. . . .

‘One thing I know, that the doctrines of some of the Newmanites are not inconsistent with, but rather are grounded upon, the wildest scepticism; and that scepticism is a yet worse evil when it is allied with fanaticism—a union which I have known to exist among Roman Catholics, and which appears to me to be one of the most fearful combinations of disease into which the human mind and soul can fall. . . .

‘From Pusey you will learn, I am sure, nothing virulent, or proud, or false, but self-denial in its true form, combined with humility and honesty¹.’

Pusey’s answer to this appeal has an interest, both personal and in relation to the true claims of the Fathers, which justifies its reproduction at length. It will be observed that he deals with the Fathers only as interpreters of Holy Scripture.

E. B. P. TO W. A. GREENHILL, ESQ.

Christ Church, Oxford, June 6, 1838.

It is very difficult to answer your question in a way which may not be, even naturally, misunderstood. For if one values anything and feels that one has grounds for so doing, one must think that another who does not value it is wrong, and for some reason fails to appreciate it. One cannot be firmly persuaded of anything, without being as firmly persuaded of the erroneousness of the contrary, whatever degree of importance one may attach to that erroneousness, which is altogether another matter. And yet if one attaches a value to anything, one would not willingly see or help another to disparage it, or look at it in the point of view from which he could not fail to disparage it. And yet all this care for another, if he be one’s superior in talent, seems the more to be assuming a superiority of some other sort.

To apply all this preface. Of course I must think those wrong somehow who disparage the Fathers: since also (whatever may be the case as to individual statements) I think they have altogether a deeper way of viewing things than moderns, deeper and truer thoughts, I must think that those who think lightly of them have, for some reason or other, failed to see their true character; and attaching value

¹ Rev. Dr. Arnold to W. A. Greenhill, Esq., June 5, 1838. Arnold, however, questions this description when writing to the same correspondent on October 24, 1838. ‘I always demur

to the praise of humility claimed for Pusey and his party; it is not humility, but something opposite to it, to rest with such entire complacency in our own views.’

as I do to them, I should be sorry to aggravate this. But then I have no question about Dr. A[mold's] talents being far greater than mine; and yet I am not only assuming that I am in the right, and he in the wrong, but I am actually unwilling to aid him in a course of study (if indeed I could) because I think it would only prejudice him further against what I believe to be truth.

All this is very embarrassing, because one cannot but seem to him to be assuming unduly; and yet I am unwilling without some protest of this sort to say anything about a study which would only revolt a person the more from what I value, and about whose value and the consequences of its disparagement my convictions are very strong.

The truth is, Dr. Arnold measures Christian antiquity by a modern standard; so do many in these days: so did I, in the very question of prophecy, once. But the two systems are altogether different and at variance: consequently, whichever you take as the standard, the other must be faulty; to the moderns, the antients must appear misty and fanciful; to those who hold the antients to be in the right, the moderns will seem shallow. I myself have, on this subject of prophecy, gone through both these stages. What led me back gradually to the antients was, as I have said to you, (1) that I found that many, perhaps the majority, of quotations of the Old Testament in the New laboured under difficulties in the modern system, from which they were free in the antient: whence it seemed that the antient system was most like that of inspired Scripture. (2) I found that the most antient Jewish interpretations were, in general principles, accordant with the antient Christian; whereas ours were derived from a modern philosophical-grammatical Jewish school, which also was an unbelieving one, since it arose in opposition to the Gospel. (Calvin's system of interpretation, which is a basis of most modern, comes, as a fact, from the later Jews; so a number of the early Protestant commentators on the Old Testament are translations from the later Jews.) (3) I was struck by finding the same interpretations in very distinct parts of the Church, and so independent of each other, and coming apparently from some common origin. (4) I was struck (as Mr. Osborne, the modern anti-patristic, is) with their great combination of Scripture, and with the beauty and apparent truth of things which I first rejected as fanciful. (5) The Fathers' views seemed to me to be much more penetrated with a consciousness of the mysterious depth of every work and way of God; according to it (and this is a very first principle implied in it) nothing in God's creation is accidental, but everything has a meaning, if we could but read it. According to a striking saying of the son of Sirach, 'All things are made double one against another, and He hath made nothing imperfect,' Ecclesiasticus xlii. 24; and xxxiii. 15, 'So look upon all the works of the Most High, and there are two and two, one against another.'

On some such grounds as these, and perhaps others, I have arrived after some time at the position in which I now am, not looking at the

modern view as untrue, but as a small portion of the truth only, and wrong when it assumes to be all, and for the most part miserably shallow. At the same time, neither do I see my way through all the *details* of antient interpretation: I have not studied enough for it: I am only satisfied that the principles of their system are right, and that much which one should reject at first sight as fanciful, is true.

But then, I know that this has been a long and gradual process with me, and I feel quite assured, without ascribing to Dr. A[rnold] any prejudice (more than I think moderns lie under to their own view), I feel morally certain beforehand that the result would be a still further depreciation of the Fathers. To one with modern views they must and do appear fanciful: a person would be repelled at every step: it would seem a mere labyrinth of arbitrary notions. Besides details, which may in a degree be erroneous, as proceeding from a faulty translation, the whole substratum almost of principles is different.

The prophetic expositions then of the Fathers is the very last part upon which I should wish a modern to enter: one who has found them wanting in *his* balance in other respects, will still more find them so here. So it is with Mr. Osborne and the rest.

After all this preface my answer to your question will be a very meagre one, and would tell nothing but what Dr. A[rnold] knows before. The books which I know are only common books: Augustine de Civ. Dei contains many, to me, valuable principles; so also I have found much to me valuable in Irenaeus, [in] Theodoret's, and Augustine's Commentaries. Theodoret would perhaps be the *least* offensive to a modern. Then there is Orig. c. Cels., Justin M. dial. c. Tryph., Eusebius Praep. Evang., Cyril Jerus. Cat. Lectures, Cyril Alex. Commentaries, Lactantius Instit. L. 4, Hippolytus de anti-Xto. I recollect also being struck some years back with some extracts from Primasius, Victorinus, Arethas in Prof. Lee's App. to his Sermons (on the Apocalypse). What I know myself of the Fathers on prophecy is, for the most part, less from systematic reading than from endeavouring to ascertain their views on particular points, prophecies, types, and whether there was agreement among them in detail. Newman or Keble know a great deal more, as, indeed, some of these books are on Newman's recommendation.

Of our early (post-reformation) English exposition of prophecy, if we had any, I know nothing: the later was against the deists, and so fell into the error of looking for rigid proof, or rather, looking to such prophecy only as admitted of rigid proof, and so became a mere confined study of insulated texts.

This is the best I can do towards answering your question, and I hope that it will not be misunderstood if I express strongly my conviction that any attempt to engraft the Fathers into a modern system can only end in disappointment and disgust; and that I should desire strongly to dissuade from the study any one imbued with modern

principles. I should think he could get no good and would rather get harm from them.

I may add, that the chief repertoria of antient Jewish interpretation are Martini *Pugio fidei*, and Schoettgen *Horae Hebr. T. 2 de Messia*; but this would be still less intelligible than the Fathers. Hulsii *Theol. Jud.* is also a good book.

I am afraid that you have but a thankless office: I really wish, however, not to give pain or offence, as far as I can consistently with honesty.

With every good wish,

Ever yours most truly,

E. B. PUSEY.

For some years Pusey, it will have been seen, knew the Fathers mainly by extracts, reading passages to which his attention was called by the copious Benedictine indices: he had not time, as yet, for more. Even the tract on Baptism appears to represent this earlier and meagre sort of knowledge of them, at least very largely—a knowledge which differed altogether from that of ten years later, when he read treatise after treatise over and over again; when, to use his own favourite phrase, he ‘lived in St. Augustine,’ so that his whole thought became saturated with that of the great African father. Still, in 1835–1836, he knew enough of the Fathers to know how much the Church of England had missed by so largely losing sight of them. In the seventeenth century her divines were as conversant with them as any theologians in Europe, but the Fathers were gradually forgotten as the eighteenth century advanced. This lamentable result was due partly to their identification, in the eyes of the Hanoverian bishops, with the troublesome learning of the Non-jurors; partly to the exigencies of the Deistic controversy, in which they could not be appealed to as in any sense authorities which both sides would recognize; and partly to the shallowness which was characteristic of the time, and which only too readily persuaded itself that a large and exacting study was, after all, needless and unfruitful. Now and then men cast their eyes back upon the fields which had been so dear to their predecessors; Waterland could not controvert the assailants of the God-

head of the Son and of the Spirit without an appeal to antiquity; but his timid and apologetic tone when discussing the use and value of ecclesiastical antiquity¹ shows that he felt the temper of the age to be against him. English divines were in fact more influenced by such writers as Mosheim and Daillé than they would have liked to own; and although Milner's 'Church History' gave evidence of a sense of the spiritual beauty of the ancient Church, the theology of its author was too much controlled by a narrow and distorted tradition to enable him to do justice even to St. Augustine.

With the rise of the Oxford Movement, the Fathers naturally assumed what to that generation was a new degree of importance. It was impossible to recall men's minds to the teaching and principles of the Primitive Church of Christ without having recourse to those great writers who were the guides and exponents of its faith. Accordingly, one of the earlier cares of the writers of the 'Tracts for the Times' had been to reprint, under the title of 'Records of the Church,' some of the most characteristic documents of the Ante-Nicene Church, or passages from them. The Epistles of St. Ignatius, the accounts of the Martyrs of Lyons and Vienne, and the Martyrdom of St. Polycarp; St. Irenaeus, and Tertullian on the Rule of Faith; and the latter on Baptism; St. Justin Martyr on Primitive Christian Worship; St. Cyprian on Church Unity; and, among later writers, Vincent of Lerins on the Tests of Heresy and Error,—these and others furnished papers which had a present and practical, no less than an antiquarian and profoundly religious interest. It was natural for the Tract-writers to honour the Fathers of the Church. It was as natural for writers of the Latitudinarian School to disparage them so far as was consistent with literary taste. Hampden indeed has some interesting remarks upon St. Jerome, St. Ambrose, and St. Augustine, when he is engaged in accounting for 'the ascendancy of the Latin clergy over the Greek².'

¹ 'Works,' iii. 601 sqq.

² 'Bampton Lectures,' p. 14.

But interspersed with these observations are expressions which show that he regarded the authority of these august names as not more deserving of respect than that of his own contemporaries: St. Ambrose has 'the practical dexterity of the man of the world'; St. Jerome unites 'dark and solitary abstractedness of mind with dexterous facility in wielding to theoretic views the complex means which human society presents'; St. Augustine's 'shrewdness and versatility' is contrasted unfavourably with 'the freshness and simplicity of the Apostle¹.' Indeed, it would seem, according to Dr. Hampden, that dexterity, shrewdness, knowledge of the world, and similar qualifications were almost the sole characteristics of the Saints who, beyond any other men, expressed and formed the mind of Western Christendom.

'I cannot refrain,' wrote Pusey, 'from protesting earnestly against the harsh and often bitter and sarcastic language employed by Dr. Hampden towards the Fathers of the Christian Church, and whole classes of God's departed servants. Indeed, the language generally employed towards those of old time, the ironical use of the words "orthodox" and "heretical," and the whole view of the Latin Church as being governed by a carnal ambitious policy, as well in its stand against Pelagianism as against Arianism, remind one of the language and views of the infidel Gibbon, but one should not have expected them in the work of a Christian theologian².'

But there was another reason for bringing the Fathers prominently before the minds of Church people. As the Fathers had gradually dropped out of view, it had been assumed by Roman Catholics, and too often tacitly conceded by English Churchmen, that in reality they altogether belonged to the former, and that if English writers appealed to them it was only for such purposes as those of framing *ad hominem* arguments against the Church of Rome. To claim continuity with the Primitive Church and be ignorant of its representative writers was impossible; and yet what if the Fathers did witness for Rome after all? Pusey and

¹ 'Bampton Lectures,' pp. 17-19 (3rd edition).

² Dr. Hampden's 'Theological Statements,' pp. xxix-xxxiii. See reff.

Newman alike felt that this apprehension could only be met if people could be made to learn something about them, not by mere extracts, but as parts of a vast literature. Newman's reason for reprinting Archbishop Ussher on 'Prayers for the Dead' is that at the time of doing so 'many persons were in doubt whether they were not driven to an alternative of either giving up the Primitive Fathers or of embracing Popery.' The reason warranted a much more considerable enterprise. If it was good to learn something about the Fathers from Archbishop Ussher, it was better to learn more about them from themselves.

Thus, among the reasons for thinking a 'Library of the Fathers' very desirable, Pusey urges in the Prospectus of that work

'the circumstance that the Anglican branch of the Church Catholic is founded upon Holy Scripture and the agreement of the Universal Church, and that therefore the knowledge of Christian antiquity is necessary in order to understand and maintain her doctrines, and especially her creeds and her liturgy.' He pleads 'the importance at the present crisis of exhibiting the real practical value of Catholic antiquity, which is disparaged by Romanists in order to make way for the later Councils¹, and by others, in behalf of modern and private interpretations of Holy Scripture.' 'Romanists,' he says, 'are in great danger of lapsing into secret infidelity, not seeing how to escape from the palpable errors of their own Church without falling into the opposite errors of Ultra-Protestants.' And thus 'it appeared an act of special charity to point out to such of them as are dissatisfied with the state of their own Church a body of ancient Catholic truth, free from the errors alike of modern Rome and of Ultra-Protestantism.'

Not that the only or the main reasons for popularizing the more important works of the ancient Fathers were polemical reasons. These works had a substantive value of their own. They satisfied, as modern publications did not satisfy, the increased 'demand for sacred reading'; they gave readers

¹ This might seem inconsistent with the Roman claim to be at home in antiquity in a sense which Anglicans cannot be. But practically it was observed that Roman Catholics 'profess to appeal to primitive Christianity: we honestly take their ground,

as holding it ourselves; but when the controversy grows animated and descends into details they suddenly leave it, and desire to finish the dispute on some other field.' Newman's 'Prophetical Office of the Church,' p. 59.

something to think about. They were a valuable corrective to the tendency to narrowness which is observable in separate branches of the Church; they bring the thought of particular Churches into communion with the thought of the Universal Church, when outwardly united. They are a safeguard against modern errors, which they combat while those errors were still in their original form, before men's minds were familiarized with them, and so in danger of partaking of them. Some of the Fathers, too, are especially valuable as commentators on the New Testament, not only from their representative position in the ancient Church, but especially because the language of the New Testament was to them a living language. And thus, in the eyes of a scholar, St. Chrysostom's Homilies on the New Testament, independently of their other merits, have at least, as Pusey often said, the value which attaches to scholia on Aristophanes. But more especially do the Fathers attest the existence of Catholic agreement in a great body of truth in days when the Church of Christ was still visibly one, and still spoke one language; and thus they also bear witness against the fundamentally erroneous assumptions of modern times, that truth is only that which each man troweth, and that the divisions of Christendom are unavoidable and without remedy.

When the first volume of the Library appeared¹, Pusey, by the advice of the Primate, of which Keble reminded him, prefixed some observations, which are chiefly designed to meet popular misapprehensions on the subject, especially such as were current in Puritan quarters. To the question whether the Church of England attributes any authority to the ancient Fathers of the Church, Pusey replies by pointing to the canon of the Convocation of 1571, which enacts that

‘Clergy shall be careful never to teach anything from the pulpit, to be religiously held and believed by the people, but what is agreeable to

¹ ‘The Confessions of St. Augustine, revised from a former translation by the Rev. E. B. Pusey, D.D., with illustrations from St. Augustine himself’ Oxford: Parker, Rivingtons, 1838.

the doctrine of the Old or New Testament, and collected out of that same doctrine by the Catholic Fathers and ancient Bishops.'

The Convocation which made this canon also enforced subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles, so that, as Pusey remarks, even when the Church of England was 'fencing herself round as a particular Church, she formally maintained her connexion with the Church Catholic' by the authority which she ascribed to its great teachers. Pusey brushes away the modern Puritan misapprehension that the authority of the Fathers was put forward as co-ordinate with or in rivalry to that of Holy Scripture. Referring to the canon, he points out that

'Scripture is revered as paramount: the "doctrine of the Old or New Testament" is the source; the "Catholic Fathers and ancient Bishops" have but the office of "collecting out of that same doctrine"; the Old and New Testaments are the fountain; the Catholic Fathers the channel through which it has flowed down to us. The contrast then in point of authority is not between Holy Scripture and the Fathers, but between the Fathers and *us*; not between the book interpreted and the interpreters, but between one class of interpreters and another; between ancient Catholic truth and modern private opinions; not between the Word of God and the word of man, but between varying modes of understanding the Word of God.'

To the objection embodied in a popular Puritan phrase, that the recognition of the authority of the Fathers as interpreting the mind of Holy Scripture involved an 'appeal to fallible men,' Pusey replies that the Church's appeal is

'not to the Fathers individually, or as individuals, but as witnesses; not to this or that Father, but to the whole body, and agreement of Catholic Fathers and ancient Bishops.'

Particular Fathers might be under a personal bias, as was St. Augustine with regard to some part of his controversy with the Pelagians. Or they might represent the mind only of particular Churches when it was not in harmony with that of other Churches, or of the Church Catholic. It is when they attest that which had been received 'by all, in all Churches, and at all times,' that their authority is entitled to the high consideration claimed for it.

It was further urged by popular religionists that if the Fathers were to be authorities they would supersede that of the Church of England. Pusey maintains that there is no more of antagonism between the Fathers and the Church of England than between the Fathers and Holy Scripture. The Fathers interpret the true mind of the Church of England by the light which they throw upon its formularies, which in many cases belong to the ages in which they themselves lived and taught.

‘Much doctrine is contained in our collects, much in our Sacramental services, which, as belonging to high antiquity, can only be fully understood by means of that antiquity whence it is derived, and which, so understood, will appear in its real character.’

He goes on to discuss the disagreement which is observable between the Fathers, on certain points of detail, in pages of lasting value. The current phrases about

‘the harshness of Tertullian, the predestinarianism of St. Austin, Origen’s speculativeness, Arnobius’ deficient acquaintance with the Gospel he defended, are witnesses that there is a tangible distinction between Catholic truth and individual opinion’

as handed down to us in the pages of the Fathers. But the real question is whether our ‘received notions’ are always an adequate criterion of the truth or worth of patristic teaching. For instance, the ancient mystical school of interpretation finds scant favour in the modern world, although it has ample warrant in the models of interpretation furnished by the New Testament.

‘It is,’ urges Pusey, ‘a vulgar and commonplace prejudice which would measure everything by its own habits of mind, and condemn that as fanciful to which it is unaccustomed, simply because it, confined and contracted by treading its own matter-of-fact round, cannot expand itself to receive it, or has no power to assimilate it to its own previous notions or adapt them to it. It is the same habit which would laugh at one who came from a foreign clime in a garb which to a peasant-eye is unwonted. “He who laughs first,” says Dr. Johnson, “is the barbarian.”’

He is quite alive to the mistakes which ‘ardent minds’ might make in this unaccustomed field of interest. There

is danger 'in taking up at once what *may* be no portion of Catholic truth, although it occur in some particular Father whom one with reason venerates.' 'We may not be Augustinians, any more than Calvinists or Lutherans,' for though St. Augustine made no system, but transmitted Catholic truth, we might readily form a system out of St. Augustine. The Fathers are to be studied, not with the object of discovering in them some new truth, but in order the better to appreciate the treasures of doctrine and devotion which are offered us by the Church of England.

Pusey often said that if good people would read the Fathers, instead of talking about them without having read them, there would not be much room for controversy as to their merits. But it was necessary to bring the Fathers within general reach : so long as they were to be approached only in dead languages and expensive folios they would continue to be talked about without being read.

The idea of a Library of the Fathers seems to have taken definite shape during a visit which Newman paid to Pusey at Holton Park on August 24, St. Bartholomew's Day, 1836. Pusey was anxious to bring about a meeting between Newman and Mr. Tyndale, the clergyman of the parish, who held very Low Church opinions; so Newman dined and slept at Holton, returning to Oxford the next morning. The Vicar's opinions would not appear to have been much modified, but the meeting of the two friends was one of the most fruitful in the history of the Movement. The results appear in a letter which Pusey addressed to Newman shortly afterwards, and which is interesting as showing in combination the qualities which made Pusey what he was: his eagerness as a student, his natural aptitude for business, his zeal for theological truth, and his unlimited capacity for taking trouble.

E. B. P. TO THE REV. J. H. NEWMAN.

[Holton Park, Sept. 1836.]

I send you a sketch of a letter which I propose to send to such coadjutors as might occur to mind. We have a very excellent amanuensis in this house, so if you would alter this copy as would suit

you, or write another, you could receive any number of copies, in which the details might be ready written, and you would only have to add what you wished to the individual.

The coadjutors I would write to are Oxnam, Lushington, Bliss, Wood, T. Mozley, Wilson (K.'s curate), Mr. Wodehouse (a High Churchman in Girdlestone's neighbourhood and reads the Fathers), Harrison, Hook, Thornton (my cousin, a good scholar and able person). Many more will occur when we meet in Oxford.

Of St. Augustine's Anti-Pelagian Tracts, my impression is that the 'De Peccatorum Meritis et Remissione' (three books) would do best for translation: it is less predestinarian than some, and has not the personal refutation of others. I have just read through the first book: there is a good deal of close argument from the text of Scripture, no imaginativeness, or patristicalness; but it is plain and straightforward, condensed (though with repetitions, which will bring the subject back again to people's thoughts): he argues also well and convincingly from Scripture against the non-transmission doctrine, so that it will be a good antidote to Dr. Hampden; and the connexion of regeneration and justification by faith with Baptism, and the blessings of the Church as being entrusted with Baptism, are interestingly though incidentally put. One thing will offend people: that he argues the condemnation of the unbaptized, even infants, or those who he supposes would have embraced the Gospel had it been preached to them,—but a note prefixed might disclaim all, wherein Scripture is mercifully silent, and the Church has pronounced nothing, and so give us an opportunity of distinguishing between the sentiments of individual Fathers and Catholic truths. There are some long quotations from Scripture (I suppose because Scripture was scarcer and people could not refer to it) which might be thrown into notes. I suppose we shall have some very brief notes to add, if it is only in the way of the Benedictines, explaining a Father's meaning by other passages, or correcting him, but very briefly.

As you have made a selection from *Cyprian*, I will confine myself to comparing three tracts with Marshall's translation, to see whether what we print of Cyprian might be reprinted from it, revising it only if necessary.

I have brought over St. Chrysostom on Genesis and St. Augustine on St. John to look at, at my leisure, and I have occasion to read several books of the *De Civitate Dei*.

Shall I write the letter to Rivington?

Size. I think 8vo. would be best: we may become otherwise so very voluminous. (Girdlestone's Commentary sells.) The (Richmond's) 'Library of the Reformers' is a good-sized 8vo. If we carry on our 'Quinque-articulated' Library (Practical, Doctrinal, Historical, Anti-Heretical, Expository) we should soon have above a hundred little volumes.

Form. I would propose having two title-pages, one like that which

I have put down in the circular, and then another title for the particular Father (taking your hint). This would allow us to go on with all at once like the Encyclop. Metrop.

Circulation. Would it not be well to take in Cambridge, or at least Dublin, Edinburgh, Glasgow, and chiefly some American booksellers, so as to act upon the two hemispheres at once? It might be a great help to soundness of doctrine there, and so (by the reaction) here also.

I should like to stipulate for a certain number of copies free, that we might be able to make presents to institutions, e.g. Durham, New York, King's College, &c., and that we might have other copies at cost price for presents.

If you think it better to *print* a circular, I would do it; but that I suppose should be more formally drawn up. Do not on any account spare our amanuensis, for she is very willing, and able not to 'sell,' but to 'give' her time.

Ever your very affectionate friend,

E. B. P.

I become more sanguine as the task seems to enlarge; though I do feel the necessity of being as a weaned child, lest I mar our own plan.

Pusey and Newman were not at first entirely of one mind as to the nature of the proposed translations. Pusey was in favour of exactly literal translations: Newman pleaded for freedom and idiomatic renderings. Pusey deprecated diffusiveness.

'I,' writes Newman, 'do not like diffusive translations; unliteralness is no more diffuse than the contrary; I only meant not word for word. "Placet mihi" may be Englished, "it pleases me," or "I please." Here, what is least literal, whether better or not, is shorter. All I meant was idiomatic translation.'

'I agree with you perfectly,' Pusey replied, 'on the principles of translation; although I think that one may even sacrifice idiom, if one may so call it, to retain an effect of the original, e.g. transposition, which one language will bear, although against its natural genius, in order to keep an emphatic collocation. At the same time I admit that I am too idiomatic.'

Pusey always inclined to the principle here expressed, namely, the sacrifice of the idiom of the language into which he was translating to the more exact rendering of the phrases as well as of the words of the original. For

many years his adherence to this principle in translations acted unfavourably on his own style as an original writer of English : people said that he wrote like a Father of the fourth century. It was a result of his idea of the sacredness and inviolability of language, especially when used by writers of authority and on sacred subjects ; but Newman's jealous anxiety for the purity and vigour of our mother tongue was not without its effect. 'My instruction,' Pusey wrote to Keble, 'to translators is "a clear, nervous, condensed, unparaphrastic style, and thus as free and as like an original, and idiomatic as may be"—conditions more easily prescribed than fulfilled.'

His own practice is best described in his preface to the 'Confessions of St. Augustine':—

'The object of all translation must be to present the ideas of the author as clearly as may be, with as little sacrifice as may be of what is peculiar to him : the greatest clearness with the greatest faithfulness. . . . In that reproduction, which is essential to good translation, it is very difficult to avoid introducing some slight shade of meaning which may not be contained in the original. The very variation in the collocation of words may produce this. In the present work the translator desired both to preserve as much as possible the condensed style of St. Augustine, and to make the translation as little as might be of a commentary, that so the reader might be put as far as possible in the position of a student of the Fathers, unmodified and undiluted by the intervention of any foreign notions.'

Apologizing for the 'rigid style' which this theory of translation implies, Pusey expresses a hope

'that the additional pains which might be requisite to understand it would be rewarded by the greater insight into the author's uncommented meaning which that very pains would procure, and by the greater impression made by what has required some thought to understand : and it was an object to let St. Augustine speak as much as possible for himself, without bringing out by the translation, truths which he wrapped up in the words for those who wished to find them¹.'

The theory of translation being settled—if it was settled—the financial difficulty presented itself. How could a

¹ 'Confessions of St. Augustine. Revised from a former translation by Rev. E. B. Pusey, D.D.' Oxford, 1838, pref. pp. xxxi, xxxii.

long series of authors, for whom there was as yet no demand, be published, without involving translators and publishers in ruinous expenses? Pusey began the solution of the difficulty by taking it for granted that, like himself, all the translators could or would do their work for nothing. Newman soon saw that this was practically impossible. At first he had said:—

‘Somehow, when I come to think of it, I should not like anything to be said to R[ivington] which seemed to make our plan a speculation. Men in business are ready enough to catch up the idea, that godliness is literally gain: and this would seem to be laying a *plan* for emolument.’

But by Sept. 8th he writes, ‘I feel sure that the translators must be paid: it has grown on me.’

But this was only half the difficulty. Would the ‘Fathers’ sell even if translated? Messrs. Rivingtons evidently thought this doubtful: they positively declined to undertake the publication unless a body of subscribers would back them up. Thereupon Pusey offered them to risk £1,000, and inquired what the expense of four volumes a year for four years would be, it being understood that the translators should be paid. Messrs. Rivingtons ‘took no notice’ of the offer, but continued to insist on the list of subscribers. At last Pusey and Newman gave way.

‘As we have agreed about the subscription,’ writes Pusey to Newman, Oct. 13, ‘I sent the amended prospectus to Rivington yesterday. . . . I think it [viz. the plan of a subscription-list] will be good; because we both disliked it, and yet are come into it.’

For some weeks Pusey and Newman acted alone, but it was all along in Pusey’s mind to obtain Keble’s co-operation.

E. B. P. TO THE REV. J. KEBLE.

Sept. 22, 1836.

Two days ago I saw the Bishop of Oxford: he is very much pleased with the specimen of your version of the Psalms, and in answer to my question ‘whether he would have any objection to *license* it,’ said several times, ‘Certainly not.’ I repeated the question,

hardly daring to believe anything so satisfactory, and he repeated his answer. Newman says 'licensing' is a poetical term: however, there is as much (not to say more) truth in poetry as in prose; so whether it be a 'poetical license' or no, I am more than contented. I should propose then, with your leave, to look over the first fasciculus, and marking [it], if in any respects I think that the Hebrew might be better rendered. You need not speak of trouble, as you once did, for it is all in my way; and I am lecturing on the Psalms, and shall be interested in seeing your version: and when you see this fasciculus you can send me the rest, if you think it worth while.

But, as to trouble, Newman and I have a design upon a *quid pro quo* from you. For we are proposing to edit a

Library
of Catholic Fathers
of the Holy Church Universal
anterior to the division of the East and West.

Translated by Members of the Anglican Church,
with notices of the respective Fathers, and brief notes by the
Editors when required,
and Indices.

The duties of the editors will be to select works for translation; revise translations, at least in the commencement, in order to set the translators in a good way of translating; add the above-named notes; select or write the notices; superintend the formation of indices;—in short, superintend the whole, as they make themselves responsible for the whole. How much or how little work this will give I know not: but the benefits of the plan seem to grow upon me much; and all which I hear is very encouraging. Mr. Dodsworth and the Bishop of Oxford both spoke of persons looking out and wishing for something of the sort. We have selected a good deal already, and shall have, I suppose, abundance of hints; so that this part will not be laborious. In order to avoid any charge of 'speculating,' we have proposed to make nothing by it. And so now that there is nothing but disinterested, i. e. unproductive, labour we have thought fit to join your name as editor. I hope to have the prospectus in the *British Critic and Magazine* of October, and it is now being put in type: so I have actually sent your name as joint editor, waiting only for your formal sanction of it.

I hope that you will not think it very bold; but, you know, 'a treble cord, &c.': and last year you and Newman left me to write my tracts 'on Holy Baptism' by myself, and to bear all the brunt of the *Record*; so this year I have intertwined yours and Newman's names so fast that I hope they will not easily slip away. In sober earnest, I wish that we could have given you more time to think about it (or rather that I had done so), but the month has slipped

away faster than I thought. You shall do as much or as little as you like ; only, please, let us join your name with ours.

Let me hear from you (a line or two) as soon as you can, and direct Christ Church. . . . I have written to Rose, about asking the Archbishop of Canterbury to allow it to be dedicated to him.

To this letter the Rev. J. H. Newman added :—

‘ You must not think we are hurrying you into a plan of our own. Of course nothing shall be done about your name till we hear from [you ?].’

Two other long letters besides that to Keble were written from Holton Park during the quiet hours of the morning of September 22nd. Mrs. Pusey had driven over with the Tyndales to the consecration of the new church at Littlemore; and in the evening the Bishop of London, Dr. Blomfield, was expected to dine and sleep, and the house would be full of company. Pusey was full of his plan, and in the evening he submitted it to Bishop Blomfield. After everybody had left the drawing-room Pusey remained up, among other reasons to announce the result to Newman :—

‘ The Bishop of London approves of the plan, and says he shall buy it [the publication] and read as much as he can. He does not like the “St.”: he says that the Apostles ought to have this pre-eminence. If you think it right, would you erase the “St.”? We can still put “Cyprian, Bishop, Saint, and Martyr,” which would do as well. I think I said what I meant the word “Catholic Father”¹ to express ; but I suppose it would exclude Tertullian’s Montanist tracts. So if you please we can concede it. The Bishop seemed to think it—as most, I suppose, would—tautologous. I like it.’

Newman replies the next day :—

‘ I write as I read, having “lionesses”², at least one, to wait upon. . . . Your news of the Bishop of London is very good. I would give up the “St.” merely because he wishes it. Not that it matters. Also the “Catholic.” But not “before the separation, &c.”’

¹ The title originally proposed was ‘Library of Catholic Fathers of the Holy Church Universal, anterior to the division of the East and West.’ The title adopted was ‘A Library of

Fathers of the Holy Catholic Church, anterior to the division of the East and West.’

² Ladies visiting Oxford.

Pusey observes in reply:—

‘It is curious how people let in what is most important without perceiving it. The Bishop of London made no objection to the “anterior to the separation of East and West.”’

Accordingly it was intended that ‘St.’ should be left out as a prefix to the names of the great Fathers. On reflection, Pusey repented.

‘October 11, 1836.

‘The names “Augustine,” &c. look sadly shorn without their “St.”; and I have some misgiving lest the dropping it should be Ultra-Protestant, and that they are outworks to the “St.” of the Holy Apostles (which also Ultra-Protestants drop), as Chapters are to Bishoprics. It does not do to take up as your position only what you really want to defend, for even if you succeed it is very rudely battered about, whereas if you keep the outwork you get rudely assailed, but the citadel is at peace. The Low Church party already talk of Paul and Peter.’

In the end Pusey’s misgivings triumphed. The Saints were called Saints; and if the Fathers were not called Catholic, the Church was.

Keble’s reply to Pusey’s letter was delayed, owing to his absence in the Isle of Wight.

REV. J. KEBLE TO E. B. P.

Hursley, October 4, 1836.

I most sincerely beg your pardon for the inconvenience and delay which I fear I have occasioned in a plan at which I am sincerely rejoiced, and am proud to have my name inserted: at least, should be proud if I were not conscious of my knowledge of the Catholic Fathers being too limited by far to justify such a step had I been [able] to choose for myself. Somehow I got it into my head that you would construe my silence into consent and so did not hurry myself in writing. As it is, I see the plan is after a sort advertized in the *British Magazine*, so I trust the inconvenience will not be great. As to the Dedication, my objecting to it was a mere speculation of Rogers’s; and I do not know that I should have thought of such a thing if he had not put it into my head. As it is, I should suppose it is a proper compliment to the Archbishop, and may make the work a little more useful. But on many accounts I should wish as little as possible to be said in the way of praise or expression of confidence. I certainly do not feel the least of *that* towards the Archbishop. We are told that he remonstrated privately about Hampden: but what

public step has he taken? What has he done that has the least tendency to warn the Church against the results of such teaching? And unless he has been belied in all the newspapers, the whole of his proceedings in Parliament about those Church Bills is only to be accounted for on the notion of his being thoroughly Erastian. Therefore I should like to limit the expression in the dedicatory sentence to 'respect for his high spiritual office': the rather that I think a time is coming when it will be impossible personally to compliment Bishops with a good conscience; and it is questionable whether our doing so at best is not a sort of impertinence. . . .

I am content to acquiesce in the subscription plan, and will endeavour to find something to contribute towards it. A list of subscribers is not to me a pleasant thought. Could we not take their money without printing their names? As far as I know, I very much approve the selection you propose. The Apostolical Fathers I imagine you consider to be sufficiently *Englished* already. But some of Justin Martyr would be desirable, would it not? and all of Irenaeus that is not merely employed with Gnostical technicalities? But no doubt selection will be the least part of our work. I hope we shall not find so very much trouble in finding translators. Wilson seems much to like the notion of it, and there must be many circumstanced about as he is, in capacity, leisure, and industry. I spoke also the other day to Eyre of Salisbury, an old pupil of mine, who appeared to relish it much, and I dare say would do justice to anything that was of tolerably easy construction. Have you thought of Oxnam, Davison's late curate, in Devonshire? He, I dare say, would like to give us some help.

It was a great piece of ungraciousness, my not telling you sooner how much I am obliged to you for your encouragement about the Psalms. I hope you will not spare your remarks, and I will not spare my questions. If I can but succeed in keeping out one irreverent hymn in our Church I should think it worth a good deal of trouble. And the Bishop of Oxford's permission gives one a sort of encouragement which one had quite despaired of.

When Keble had consented to share the editorship, Pusey wrote to ask the Archbishop of Canterbury to allow the 'Library of the Fathers' to be dedicated to him. The reply was cordial.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY TO E. B. P.

Oct. 11, 1836.

MY DEAR SIR,

In respect to the undertaking in which you are about to engage, the reasons which in general induce me to decline dedications have no weight. On the contrary, I should not feel myself justified in

foregoing the opportunity of expressing my approbation of your design.

It is highly desirable to direct the attention of the clergy to the writings of the pastors and teachers who enjoyed the highest reputation in the early ages of Christianity. Those writers at present are known to few even of the clergy, except by quotations or references on controversial questions, which convey very imperfect notions of their character or opinions.

I hope to have the pleasure of seeing Mr. Keble in the course of a few days, and conversing with him on this interesting and important subject.

I remain, my dear Sir, your faithful servant,

W. CANTUAR.

Rev. Dr. Pusey.

The Archbishop met Keble when visiting Sir W. Heathcote at Hursley Park a few days later. 'He pronounced himself afterwards more pleased with his visit there than any other in the course of his tour¹.' Keble reports his impressions to Pusey :—

REV. J. KEBLE TO E. B. P.

Hursley, Oct. 16, 1836.

I had a long conversation yesterday morning with the Archbishop about our plan. Both he and Rose are of opinion that we ought to have only whole treatises. I am sorry to lose Irenaeus, which I suppose we should by such a limitation. All those parts of him which are not taken up with *Æonology*, appear to be most admirable in themselves, and extremely applicable to the errors of this time. Then his being already so wretchedly translated, and not existing in the original, would quite take away the scruple one might otherwise feel as to the impossibility of giving an adequate representation of the original. The Archbishop is very well pleased at the notion of our doing a good deal of St. Chrysostom's Commentaries, on St. Paul's Epistles especially; and he mentioned what it will be of consequence to bear in mind, the great difference which exists between those Homilies of his which were preached at Antioch, comparatively early, and those preached at Constantinople after he was made Archbishop and had no time to write *Sermons*.

Again, he wished that 'a very good preface' should be written, pointing out the use and necessity of the work somewhat at large, and especially dwelling on the common-sense view of the subject, that as any one who would give a view (e. g.) of the Stoical philosophy would naturally go back to Zeno and Chrysippus, &c., so must those who

¹ 'Letters of J. B. Mozley,' p. 61.

wish to understand the nature and progress of Christian theology. Moreover, he wanted to know what number of volumes we proposed to send out in a year. I told him about two.

I have had a great, but I must say on the whole a melancholy, satisfaction in talking with the Archbishop on various subjects, and in watching his beautiful serene expression of countenance. I say melancholy, both because he seemed himself out of spirits, and because one cannot help feeling all the while how sad it is that such a person should in any way unconsciously lend [himself] to the purposes of the enemies of the Church.

The next thing was to go to work, but certain preliminary questions still had to be settled. Which of the Fathers was to be translated first? Pusey thought St. Chrysostom on St. Paul: Newman, St. Augustine's Confessions. Mr. H. W. Wilberforce was set to work at once on a portion of the Confessions. In the event, the Confessions were the first book to appear, and they were edited by Pusey himself. The next to follow was the Catechetical Lectures of St. Cyril of Jerusalem, translated by Mr. R. W. Church, B.A., Fellow of Oriel, who was introduced to the scheme by the Rev. C. Marriott.

'Mr. Heurtley, of C. C. C.¹' writes Newman to Pusey, Oct. 13, 'has sent to me through Mozley, to say he will undertake at once any one of St. Austin's works, naming the Psalms. We might set him at once on the St. John. He is said to be a very neat writer. Manning clings to Justin.'

The Rev. F. Oakeley, Fellow of Balliol, began to work on St. Augustine's Anti-Pelagian treatises. Indeed, there was no lack of able men who were ready to lend their assistance.

'You say,' writes Pusey to Newman, 'I never remember anything, and in this case rightly. Scott of Balliol² came upon me, and renewed the offer of his services as translator, and asked for something for this vacation. I gave him on the instant, I know not why, St. Chrysostom on 2 Corinthians; and yesterday, when I recollected that he was to have had Theodoret's Compendium of Heresies, I found that he had already done about a Homily as a specimen. He is

¹ Now Margaret Professor of Divinity.

² Afterwards Master of Balliol and Dean of Rochester.

stopped, waiting to hear from you, for I see Wood¹ was to have had 2 Corinthians. If, however, it would do as well, there are still the Galatians and the two Epistles to the Thessalonians unoccupied. Scott's translation was done very rapidly: there was not much in the Homily to serve as a text; it was rather dry—that is, the translation; but he took hints very well, and would have taken more had I had wits enough about me to give them, but a cold melts them away.'

Another question was, Should Origen's treatise against Celsus be included in the Library? Greswell had noticed, when the scheme was first mooted and before Keble had joined, that St. Cyprian was the only Ante-Nicene Father on the list of those to be translated. Newman proposed to add Origen against Celsus. Pusey objected that it was 'apologetic.' Newman replied:—

'September 25, 1836.

'I am sorry that you consider Origen "cont. Celsum" apologetic; the ancients did not write Apologies apologetically.'

'I have begun reading "Origen contra Celsum" carefully,' writes Pusey a fortnight later.

'Did you mean to say you knew and liked it? One fear of mine is that Celsus may do harm. I cannot but think that discussions about evidences, and familiarity with the low notions which people venture to have of Him, as Man, practically Socinianizes many.'

Newman answers:—

'As to Origen, what I read of his "Contra Celsum" seemed to me full of matter for reflection, and very valuable; but the very circumstance of your thinking otherwise would be a fact decisive against its publication.'

The subscription list for the Library had been left in the hands of Messrs. Rivingtons. On the day that the preface to the first volume was written, Pusey expresses his disappointment at the scanty support which the scheme had obtained.

E. B. P. TO REV. J. H. NEWMAN.

August 24, 1838.

Baxter has just sent me a list of the subscribers to the Fathers. There are scarce half a dozen names of any note, if so many, besides

¹ Mr. S. F. Wood, of Oriel College.

eight Bishops ; seven English—London, Lincoln, Bangor, Exeter, Gloucester, Chichester, Rochester ; not Oxford (I know not whether he does not like the expense), nor Salisbury, nor Ripon. I have some wish to apply to these directly or indirectly. It is such a sorry contrast to the French edition, published under the patronage of the 'Épiscopat Français.' If not indelicate, I wish one could get the patronage of the main part of the Bishops, without their subscriptions.

He wrote to the same effect to Keble. The Archbishop of Canterbury, he observes, was patron, but not a subscriber. The contrast with the French scheme was so poor, in respect of episcopal patronage. There was one Scotch bishop, 'who does not put his see.'

'Would not Bishop Sumner of Winchester subscribe, on the strength of Mr. Bickersteth and S. Wilberforce, who had done so ?'

Keble answers :—

'Sept. 8, 1838.

'I have, I hope, set a spring in motion which will touch the other Archbishop on the subject, and I shall try and get our Bishop's name, through James or Dealtry. Cannot Mr. Dodgson get at the Bishop of Ripon, and Mr. Bouverie at the Bishop of Salisbury ?'

In the event the two Archbishops appear in the first list as patrons ; nine English bishops, and two Scotch, are among the subscribers. It does not seem that Mr. Keble then succeeded either with Bishop Sumner or Bishop Denison.

But the anxious years that followed the foundation of the Library were marked by a steady increase of the interest in and support accorded to it : neither 1841, nor 1843, nor 1845, nor 1850 availed to arrest it by the troubles in which they involved its editors or promoters. In the first list of subscribers, printed in 1838, there were less than 800 names. In the second, which appeared in 1839, after the publication of the first two volumes, there were more than 1,100 subscribers and seventeen bishops. In 1843 there were twenty-five bishops, and nearly 1,800 subscribers. The list for 1851 shows twenty-nine bishops and nearly 2,500 subscribers ; in 1853 two more bishops had joined, and the

number of subscribers exceeded 3,700. This last remarkable increase of numbers was due to an earnest appeal and statement which Pusey published on November 17, 1852.

It was originally intended that four volumes of the Library should appear every year. In practice this project could not be adhered to. But from 1838 until 1854 only one year occurred in which no volume appeared: the barrenness of 1846 is to be explained by the lamentable secessions of the preceding autumn. In other years as many volumes were issued as the translators could get ready; in 1843 five volumes appeared.

From the first, Pusey had taken the lead in this important undertaking. He did not wish to do so. Newman naturally insisted on his writing the preface to the first volume, which was to explain the purpose of the 'Library.'

'What am I,' he writes to Newman, August 9, 1838, 'or what business have I to write a preface to our Library of the Fathers, when you and K. know ten times as much about the Fathers as I do? I thought I had something to say when I was in Oxford, and so I wrote what I showed you, joined, as you recollect, to the beginning of a preface to St. Augustine's Confessions. This, since it was written, I have rewritten here; but, since, the impulse has been over. And it has naturally occurred to me how much better a preface you or K. would have written. I send you this, only desiring you to pluck it, and yourself or K. to write another. It was written on the Archbishop's plan of having a sensible preface as to the value of the Fathers, as living in earlier times, and being witnesses, &c., and to satisfy fear and stop excitement. But I know not whether it is good to begin our work with an apology. And not being satisfied with my performance, I feel that no one else will be. So please do you or K. execute it.'

Newman somewhat dryly replied:—

'As to the preface, I think it very likely to be useful, and I hope you will finish it, and send it at once to press.'

He rightly thought that the question of the use and authority of the Fathers had better be dealt with by more minds than one, and in view of the objections which would inevitably be put forward as the publication proceeded. He himself discussed the subject with his wonted clearness and power in the preface to the second volume of the series,

Mr. Church's translation of the Catechetical Lectures of St. Cyril of Jerusalem.

That the 'Library of the Fathers' exerted no little influence on the Oxford Movement is probably less apparent to the world at large than to those who were, in whatever sense, behind the scenes. It was at once an encouraging and a steadying influence: it made thoughtful adherents of the Movement feel that the Fathers were behind them, and with the Fathers that ancient undivided Church whom the Fathers represented. But it also kept before their minds the fact that the Fathers were, in several respects, unlike the moderns, not only in the English Church, but also in the Church of Rome. And, above all, it reminded men of a type of life and thought which all good men, in their best moments, would have been glad to make their own.

The effort to popularize the Fathers was by no means likely to be generally welcome fifty years ago. In the view of mere scholars the Fathers shared the reproach of the New Testament: they were written by men who cared less for literature than for truth, and in a style which had far declined from the standard of classical purity, and thus they were concerned with subjects which had little attraction for those whose thoughts were mainly conversant with the Pagan world of Greece and Rome. 'Showing Christ Church library one day to a visitor, Gaisford walked rapidly past all the Fathers: waving his hand, he said, "Sad rubbish," and that was all he had to say¹.' The Puritan estimate of the Fathers was not seldom equally contemptuous, if not equally indifferent: one clergyman of this school contrasted with the pure streams of the inspired Word the 'stinking puddles of tradition' which the great writers of ancient Christendom were supposed by him to contain. It would be a great injustice, however, to charge this grotesque ignorance upon the higher minds of the school. The publication of the Library was warmly wel-

¹ T. Mozley's 'Reminiscences,' i. 356.

came by a clergyman whose life and labours alike gave him a good title to represent the best side of those with whom he generally sympathized :—

REV. E. BICKERSTETH TO E. B. P.

Watton Rectory, Herts, Nov. 18, 1836.

DEAR SIR,

Though personally unacquainted with you, and differing in some respects from views which, judging from the volumes of the Oxford Tracts, I suppose you hold, I cannot but write a few lines to express the sincere pleasure with which I view your design, in connection with Mr. Keble and Mr. Newman, of publishing a select Library of Fathers. Few things could be more seasonable, or more beneficial to the Church of England, to which, I feel more and more, it is a real privilege, in these days of disunion and division, to be united. And it is my hearty prayer that the Great Head of the Church may very greatly prosper the design for extended good.

It will give me much pleasure personally to be a subscriber, and to see my interest that I may have in the immediate circle of my friends in promoting so valuable a work.

Might it not be advisable to have an introductory address meeting the disparagements of the more recent writer Osborne, and the older works of Whitby, Edwards, Barbeyrac, Daillé, &c., respecting the study of the Fathers, candidly admitting what truth requires, yet showing the real value of their writings? But forgive me the liberty of this suggestion. I trust that you have now engaged in an undertaking which may, through the Divine blessing, be eminently serviceable to the Church of Christ.

I am, with much respect,

Faithfully yours,

E. BICKERSTETH.

[P. 3.] In my 'Christian Student,' p. 214 to 226, I have given my own views of the Christian Fathers. Since I published that work, I have from some further acquaintance been led to value them still more, and therefore to rejoice more in your present undertaking.

The publication of the 'Library of the Fathers' extended over forty-seven years, from the appearance of St. Augustine's Confessions in 1838 to that of the latter part of St. Cyril on St. John,—three years after Pusey's death,—in 1835. It comprised forty-eight volumes; the works of thirteen Fathers and ancient writers were thus offered to Englishmen in their own language. This comparatively

small number of authors is to be explained by Pusey's sense of the superior value of the great teachers of the fourth century, who spoke consciously in the name of the Universal Church, and who wrote at such great length. Of St. Chrysostom sixteen volumes were published, twelve of St. Augustine, five of St. Athanasius, and four of St. Gregory. The doctrinal treatises are, as a rule, more valuable in their translated form than the exegetical: the latter naturally lose more in the process of translation. The most important contribution to the Library, in view of the prefaces and notes which illustrate it, is Newman's St. Athanasius, which has been virtually completed by Dr. Bright; but of lasting value are Pusey's Confessions of St. Augustine, Dodgson's Tertullian, Church's St. Cyril of Jerusalem, as well as the translations of St. Cyprian and of St. Chrysostom on the Epistles, both of which, in different senses, did much to mould the thought and teaching of the clergy a quarter of a century ago. As a specimen of conscientious and reverent translation, Keble's St. Irenaeus occupies a foremost place. Pusey himself translated very little: he revised an earlier translation of St. Augustine's Confessions, and he revised the works of translators who assisted him. Newman did much more as a translator; but they both devoted themselves more especially to explaining and introducing to the world the work of others by furnishing notes or prefaces. Of prefaces Newman wrote four, Pusey twelve¹; and no less a number than fourteen, although generally very brief, were written by Marriott during his editorship of the Library from 1844 to 1857. When, in consequence of Newman's withdrawal, so great a burden of other work fell on Pusey, it was obvious that he could not continue this additional task; but throughout his was the guiding and inspiring mind.

Pusey's prefaces to successive volumes of the Library are in themselves remarkable compositions, but unfortunately less known than his other works. They are often a com-

¹ Including that to St. Ephrem, which at first was not reckoned with the Library.

mentary on passing events, and on his own mental attitude towards them, while they offer in a condensed form the ever accumulating fruits of his study and observation in the vast fields of Christian antiquity. The preface to the Confessions of St. Augustine has already been partly noticed. Besides a general vindication of the Fathers against modern forms of depreciation, it contains some pages of great beauty on the moral and spiritual value of the Confessions; his remarks on the refinement and delicacy of a really religious mind like Augustine's are especially characteristic. The preface to Tertullian is perhaps the most interesting of these compositions: it is a psychological account of the probable cause of Tertullian's fall from the Church of Christ into the Montanist heresy. Pusey notes that Tertullian's mind was remarkable for its

'acuteness, power, condensed strength, and energy; his characteristic seems to be the vivid and strong perception of single truths and principles. These he exhausts, bares them of everything extrinsic to them, and then flashes them forth the sharper and more penetrating.'

But single powers of mind, possessed in great perfection, like the vivid apprehension of single truths, may easily destroy the balance of thought, beget narrow-mindedness, one-sidedness, intellectual impatience, and so heresy. Tertullian's great failing was impatience; and Pusey's way of connecting this with his fall, and the lessons which he draws from it for the Church of our own day, are written with that practical insight into human nature which he possessed in so eminent a degree.

The preface to the Rev. R. G. Macmullen's translation of St. Augustine's Sermons is much shorter, but contains some interesting remarks on the spiritual meaning of numbers which, with Augustine and others, formed a part of religious instruction in the ancient Church. In introducing a translation of the Epistles of St. Cyprian and of the extant works of St. Pacian to English Churchmen, Pusey is greatly occupied with the question of the bearing of St. Cyprian's teaching respecting the unity and

organization of the Church of Christ on the anxieties which were pressing heavily on so many minds in the year that preceded Newman's secession.

'St. Cyprian's writings,' says Pusey, 'present the theory of the Episcopate, which bears out our position on one side and the other'—against Rome and against Puritanism. 'St. Cyprian's idea of the Episcopate is manifoldness in unity; many shepherds feeding one flock, yet therefore many that they might act in unity against any who would waste it.'

Pusey dwells on St. Cyprian's test of schism, that a member really divided from the Body of Christ, however it might for a 'time exist through the life which it brought with it from the parent stock, could not continue to have life and growth,' and then he applies this in the language of earnest conviction to the actual condition of the English Church. In his preface to St. Ephrem the recent secession of the accomplished translator to the Church of Rome obliges him again to glance at a feature of the Roman controversy. The cry 'Domine miserere' with which the preface closes echoes the sorrows of the time. Ten years followed before Pusey wrote a short preface to the sixth volume of a translation of St. Augustine on the Psalms; its chief feature is a touching passage on the character and work of the Rev. C. Marriott, whose health incapacitated him from further work.

The preface to St. Cyril on St. John, written in view of the first conference held at Bonn under Dr. Döllinger in 1874, is partly the work of Mr. P. E. Pusey, although composed under his father's guidance. It deals with the relation of St. Cyril to the doctrine of the double procession, and especially with the objection to the *Filioque* that it is an addition to the Nicaeno-Constantinopolitan Creed. The call for a third edition of St. Chrysostom's Homilies on the Romans made a revision of the translation necessary in consequence of Mr. Field's brilliant recension of the original text, and Pusey calls attention to the Rev. W. H. Simcox's labour in making the necessary changes. This paragraph and that which is prefixed to the Epistles of St. Ambrose

are his briefest compositions of this description. The latter, written when Pusey was already eighty years of age, contains an apology for his being prevented through 'over-work' from doing more. Yet later in the same year he discussed the action of the Church with respect to her dogmatic phraseology in an interesting introduction to Dr. Bright's admirable translation of the 'Later Treatises of St. Athanasius'; and on Christmas Eve he completed his last contribution to this labour of forty-five years in the long preface to his son's translation of some of the works of St. Cyril of Alexandria, in which he devotes himself to clearing away misconceptions, as he deems them, which have obscured in the eyes of men the unselfish piety of that great saint.

There were several publications, independent of the 'Library of the Fathers,' yet connected with or resulting from it. Of these the most important was the publication of the original texts of St. Augustine's Confessions, St. Chrysostom's Homilies on the New Testament, and Theodoret. The text of St. Chrysostom, restored by the Rev. F. Field, of Trinity College, Cambridge, was, Pusey held, a 'triumph for English scholarship'; and he constantly lamented the difficulty of interesting a larger number of the clergy in this most important work. Here too should be mentioned the noble labours of Pusey's only son, Mr. P. E. Pusey, to which the seven volumes of the original text of St. Cyril of Alexandria, published at the University Press, bear ample witness. Another offshoot from the Library was the 'Catena Aurea' of St. Thomas Aquinas, translated partly by Rev. Mark Pattison, of Lincoln College, and partly by Rev. J. D. Dalgairns and Mr. T. D. Ryder. This work could not form part of the Library on account of 'the dates of some few authors introduced into it,' but it appeared with the sanction of the editors of the Library between 1841 and 1845. Another project, the 'Anglo-Catholic Library,' was less directly related to the 'Library of the Fathers'; but between the two works and their promoters there was no

lack of sympathy: the Caroline divines, at least in their intentions, were children of the Fathers. With the publication of various works of the Reformation period by the Parker Society the case was largely otherwise; but even this effort was at least a contribution to historical knowledge, and was due to the general movement of religious intelligence which had its origin and impulse at Oxford.

Before the first volume of the Library could be published two points had to be settled, the terms of the dedication to the Archbishop and the frontispiece, which, it was thought, ought to appear in each volume. The care which Pusey bestowed on details, to which shallow observers might ascribe a trifling importance, illustrates his knowledge of human nature. To the mass of men truth is recommended less by the abstract language which most nearly expresses it than by the concrete signs and symbols, the easily remembered phrases, the personal associations which attend its introduction to the mind.

‘Now I am about it,’ wrote Pusey to Keble, August 22, 1838, ‘what do you think of a dedication? When the plan was first started, and we were consulting about dedicating it [the Library] to the Archbishop, I proposed to Newman one much like this:—

To the most Reverend
Father in God
WILLIAM, LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY,
Metropolitan of England,
formerly
Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford,
this Library
of Archbishops, Bishops, Doctors, and Fathers
of the Holy Catholic Church
is respectfully inscribed
with a deep veneration for his sacred office
and thankful acknowledgment
of his episcopal kindness.’

‘The original dedication,’ Pusey goes on to say, ‘had something about “private graces” as opposed to his “office.” But N. demurred to that. Altogether, that which was written at the moment seemed to me neat; this, which is a reminiscence, clumsy. So I wish you and N. would arrange one.’

Upon this Newman and Keble took the dedication in hand. But Keble at once replied to Pusey:—

‘I like very much what you have sent. I neither see that it requires much improvement nor see how to improve it. I remember myself objecting to the “private graces,” and I still think it much better to avoid all personal compliments.’

Keble’s habitual self-distrust made him at times of less service as an adviser than he might have been. ‘If you want to get anything in the way of plain counsel from dear J. K.,’ Pusey would say in later years, ‘you really must be on your guard against his humility.’

Meanwhile, however, Newman had sent to Keble his revision of Pusey’s proposal. ‘Newman,’ writes Keble to Pusey, ‘has sent me the last edition of the dedication to the Archbishop, in which I find very little to alter.’ Newman had substituted ‘Primate’ for ‘Metropolitan’ of All England; and ‘ancient bishops, fathers, doctors, martyrs, confessors,’ for ‘archbishops, bishops, doctors, and fathers.’ The first change was technically correct: the second made more of the life of the ancient Church, and less of the hierarchical gradations of the modern. Keble’s contributions to the dedication were also characteristic. He would say that the Library was inscribed ‘by his Grace’s permission’ to the Archbishop. He would read his ‘sacred office,’ instead of ‘his Grace’s high office,’—the phrase which occurred in Newman’s ‘edition.’ He would leave out the word ‘affectionate’: ‘it seems,’ he said, ‘too familiar, for myself at least.’

Pusey, delighted to get so much of a judgment out of Keble, revised the dedication accordingly.

‘N.,’ he wrote, ‘did not demur to “affectionate,” but did to “episcopal kindness.” I had some misgivings about “affectionate,” that is, whether Newman and you would like it. But I thought that “affectionate” would belong to the attachment one felt to a superior in the Church who is our “father in God.” “Episcopal kindness” I took from St. Augustine’s words of his reception by St. Ambrose, “me satis episcopaliter dilexit.” I thought it would teach people. N. thought that if he took it up in the work of an entire stranger, he

should think it "affected." So I was for having something else ; but then nothing suggested itself. "Condescending" is commonplace ; "fatherly," "paternal," might do. If this last clause expresses our feeling that he is our superior, does not this take off any familiarity of the word "affectionate" ? . . . But . . . as you like about this and all things.'

The dedication settled, what was the frontispiece to be ? That there was to be a frontispiece was taken for granted from the first ; but nothing beyond was settled, until the first volume was nearly ready for publication.

'Have you settled on our frontispiece ?' writes Pusey to Newman on August 9, 1838. 'It is not for want of thought,' replies Newman four days afterwards, 'but I *cannot* think of a frontispiece. I can think of nothing better than a device over a Cross, which is too vague and too bold.' 'I am sorry,' rejoins Pusey, 'that your wits have furnished you with no device, for we must not keep back the Fathers for it. And yet I should be glad to have it for the first [volume]. What think you, in connexion with our motto ["Thy teachers shall not be removed into a corner any more"], of the rebuilding of Jerusalem, or of a temple of which the pillars had fallen down, the pillars being the Fathers ; or, if nothing else occurs, why not Keble's simple diptych with the Latin Cross on one side and the Greek on the other, without the names and not made like a book ? I only got Rogers to add the names because I saw them in some old copies of diptychs. I think I have seen pictures of the rebuilding of Jerusalem (? in Mant) which might be reduced, and this would have the advantage of exhibiting a number of labourers, lest people should think we meant ourselves only ? Or a Gothic or Grecian Church half in ruins, with the stones lying about, ready to be replaced ?'

Mr. Parker, the bookseller, called before the letter was finished, and suggested a sketch which Mr. Combe, then just appointed to the University Press, had been engaged in preparing. It was a restoration of Wells Cathedral, with the niches filled with figures, who might be the Fathers, with labels underneath each. An alternative proposal was a tower, with four figures of principal Fathers.

'They might,' adds Pusey, 'be of different Churches, Augustine, Chrysostom, Ambrose, Athanasius. This would admit of the figures being larger, so as to preserve something of the traditional likeness.'

'Parker's notion of our availing ourselves of this reviving

love of Gothic architecture to connect it with religious objects' evidently attracted Pusey. 'But,' he adds, 'after all there seems nothing so simple as the plain hard diptych with the two crosses.'

Later Newman writes:—

'Acland¹ has given me several thoughts for a device for the title-page. First, which will not do, the *Cœtus Doctorum* (Raffaëlle's), commonly called the "di Sacramento," I think. Next, Raffaëlle's cartoon, "Pasce oves meos." Thirdly, which I like, a lithograph of Jacobson's: a figure of Theology with two children, one reading, the other looking in her face, and doctors on each side. The only fear is the size of them.'

Nothing however was settled, as Pusey had desired, in time to decorate the first volume of the Library. The frontispiece eventually adopted was a figure of St. John the Baptist seated on a rock in the wilderness, and pointing with his left hand to heaven, while his right holds a rude cross, with a pendant scroll inscribed 'Vox clamantis in deserto.' Pusey had proposed to add a Lamb. Newman objected. 'Would not the addition of a Lamb rather complicate the emblem? At present the "vox in deserto" is the *idea*. Ought we to bring in a second?' The cross seems to have been substituted for the Lamb. The frontispiece finally adopted appears for the first time in the ninth volume of the series,—St. Chrysostom's Homilies on the Statues,—published in 1842; although the rock on which the Baptist is seated is inscribed with the date, Advent, 1836. That earlier date may have been chosen, not only as marking the formation of a settled resolve to embark on an important enterprise, but also as recalling the hopes of a brighter time than 1842. Appearing at this later date the frontispiece has a pathos all its own: it expresses the mood of a period when the buoyant hopes of six years before had given way to anxiety lest the Church of England should turn a deaf ear to the great preachers of ancient Christianity. Truth might once more be but a voice crying in

¹ Now Sir T. D. Acland, Bart.

the wilderness ; but to speak it constantly, to rebuke that which contradicts it boldly, and, if need were, patiently to suffer for its sake, are always and beyond question Christian duties. This Pusey continued to do, as in other ways, so also in this Library of the Fathers, until his last days. Three months before his death he wrote the following letter :—

E. B. P. TO REV. J. JACKSON.

June 14, 1882.

My work for the Library of the Fathers is done. There are yet to come out the 2nd volume of St. Cyril on St. John's Gospel, of which the first was translated by my son ; I hope also that a volume of St. Gregory Nazianzen will be revised by my friend Mr. Walford. I have myself no longer any time to revise anything. At nearly eighty-two one cannot increase work. And yet I know by experience that every translation, if ever so careful, does need some revision. St. Jerome's letters are, of course, interesting. Perhaps the Library of the Fathers may come into some hands who would fill up the gaps. But I, you see, cannot do anything.



FRONTISPIECE TO THE LIBRARY OF THE FATHERS.

APPENDIX TO CHAPTER XVIII.

THE LIBRARY OF THE FATHERS.

<i>Father.</i>	<i>Date.</i>	<i>Translator.</i>	<i>Preface by</i>
1. S. Augustine's Confessions	August 24, 1838	Revised by E. B. Pusey	E. B. Pusey.
2. S. Cyril's Catechetical Lectures	Sept. 21, 1838	R. W. Church	J. H. Newman.
3. S. Cyprian	April 25, 1839	C. Thornton	J. H. Newman.
4 & 5. S. Chrysostom on 1 Cor., Part i. and ii.	1839	H. K. Cornish John Medley	J. Keble.
6. S. Chrysostom on Galatians and Ephesians	1840	W. J. Copeland	J. H. Newman.
7. S. Chrysostom on Romans	1841	J. B. Morris	C. Marriott.
8. S. Athanasius against Arians, Part i.	March 7, 1842	J. H. Newman	
9. S. Chrysostom on the Statues	1842	E. Budge (Christ's Coll., Cambridge)	C. Marriott.
10. Tertullian (Apologetic and Practical Treatises)	June 24, 1842	C. Dodgson	E. B. Pusey (with notes).
11. S. Chrysostom on S. Matthew, Part i.	1843	Sir George Prevost	(Preface reserved for Vol. ii.)
12. S. Chrysostom on Pastoral Epistles and Philemon	1843	J. Tweed (C. C. C., Cambridge)	C. Marriott.
13. S. Athanasius' Historical Tracts	Dec. 4, 1843	M. Atkinson	J. H. Newman.
14. S. Chrysostom on Philemon, Colossians, and Thessalonians	1843	Phil. W. C. Cotton Col. J. Ashworth Thess. J. Tweed	C. Marriott.
15. S. Chrysostom on S. Matthew, Part ii.	1844	Sir George Prevost	
16. S. Augustine, Sermons, Vol. i.	June 11, 1844	R. G. Macmullen	E. B. Pusey.
17. Epistles of S. Cyprian and extant works of S. Pacian	Whitsuntide, 1844	(S. Cyprian) H. Carey (S. Pacian) C. H. Collyns	E. B. Pusey.

<i>Father.</i>	<i>Date.</i>	<i>Translator.</i>	<i>Preface by</i>
18. S. Gregory the Great, Morals on the Book of Job, Vol. i.	Nov. 30, 1844	Anonymous	C. Marriott.
19. Select Treatises of S. Athanasius	Dec. 6, 1844	J. H. Newman	Preface unavoidably postponed.
20. S. Augustine, Sermons, Vol. ii.	1845	R. G. Macmullen	
21. S. Gregory, Morals, Vol. ii.	1845	Anonymous	
22. S. Augustine, Seventeen Short Treatises	1847	C. L. Cornish H. Browne	C. Marriott.
23. S. Gregory, Morals, Vol. iii. Part i.	1847	Anonymous	
24. S. Augustine on the Psalms, Vol. i.	1847	J. Tweed and another	C. Marriott.
25. S. Augustine on the Psalms, Vol. ii.	1848	J. Tweed	
26. S. Augustine on S. John, Part i.	Ascension-tide, 1848	H. Browne and another	H. Browne. C. Marriott.
27. S. Chrysostom on 2 Cor.	Nov. 23, 1848	J. Ashworth	C. Marriott.
28. S. Chrysostom on S. John, Part i.	Nov. 30, 1848	G. T. Stupart	C. Marriott.
29. S. Augustine on S. John, Part ii.	1849	H. Browne and another	
30. S. Augustine on the Psalms, Vol. iii.	June 23, 1849	T. Scratton	C. Marriott.
31. S. Gregory, Morals, Vol. iii. Part ii.	1850	J. Bliss	
32. S. Augustine on Psalms, Vol. iv.	Advent, 1850	H. M. Wilkins	C. Marriott.
33. S. Chrysostom on the Acts, Part i.	July 25, 1851	J. Walker J. Sheppard	C. Marriott.
34. S. Chrysostom on S. Matthew, Part ii.	Advent, 1851	Sir George Prevost	C. Marriott.
35. S. Chrysostom on the Acts, Part ii.	1852	J. Walker J. Sheppard	Probably by translators.
36. S. Chrysostom on S. John, Part ii.	1852	G. T. Stupart	
37. S. Augustine on the Psalms, Vol. v.	April 25, 1853	H. M. Wilkins	C. Marriott.
38. S. Athanasius, Festal Epistles	May, 1854, dated from Cambridge	H. Burgess	H. G. W[ilberforce].
39. S. Augustine on the Psalms, Vol. vi.	Advent, 1857	H. Walford	E. B. Pusey.
40. S. Justin the Martyr	Whitsuntide, 1861	G. J. Davie	Long preface by E. B. Pusey.
41. S. Ephrem (from the Syriac)			
42. Five Books of S. Irenaeus against Heresies	Oct. 1, 1872	J. Keble	P. E. Pusey.

<i>Father.</i>	<i>Date.</i>	<i>Translator.</i>	<i>Preface by</i>
43. S. Cyril on S. John, Vol. i.	July, 1874	P. E. Pusey	Greater part by E. B. Pusey.
† S. Chrysostom on the Hebrews	May, 1877	T. Keble J. Keble	P. E. Pusey.
† S. Ambrose's Epistles	Lent, 1881	Revised by H. Wal- ford	E. B. Pusey.
† Later Treatises of S. Athanasius	Oct. 1881	W. Bright	E. B. Pusey.
† S. Cyril against Nes- torius	Christmas, 1881	P. E. Pusey	E. B. Pusey.
† S. Cyril on S. John, Vol. ii.	Nov. 1885	P. E. Pusey T. Randell	H. P. Liddon.

† Not numbered with the earlier volumes.

APPENDIX A.

HISTORY OF THE PUSEY AND BOUVERIE FAMILIES.

STEMMATA QUID FACIUNT?

THE modest hill known as Faringdon Clump, which was planted with Scotch firs by the Poet Laureate Pye, commands a good general view of the district in which Pusey is situated. As the eye follows the course of the upper Thames from the distant environs of Lechlade to the wooded slopes of Wytham Park, it is natural to contrast the low water meadows on the left bank of the river at and below Faringdon, with the higher table land on the right, which, as at Buckland and Harrowdown, sometimes rises even abruptly from the water's edge, and then gently declines southwards to the foot of the Downs, and eastwards to the lower level of the Thames below Abingdon. This tolerably level district, known as the Vale of Whitehorse, is thus bounded by the river and the Cumnor hills on the north, and on the south by the long line of the Downs; it is watered by the Ock and some smaller contributories. The soil¹ is of a character to make it at once fertile and healthy, so that in many villages fever is unknown, and longevity is common in all ranks of life. The population is as purely English as any in England: fragments of the old dialect² and warm attachment to home³ still survive the influences of schools and railroads; and the neighbourhood abounds in associa-

¹ The basin of the Ock is principally excavated in Kimmeridge clay, with detached hills of Portland stone and sands. Phillips, 'Geology of Oxford and the Valley of the Thames,' p. 40: 'near Pusey House coral rag underlies the light loam of the surface soil everywhere.'

² Such words as 'unked' for unwell, and the plural termination 'en,'

as in 'housen' for houses, are still common.

³ The late Mr. Pusey once tried to persuade a head ploughman to remove to a cottage nearer the scene of the man's daily work. 'I had rather,' was the reply, 'live like a labourer at Charney, than like a gentleman at Pusey.'

tions which belong to the history of England. The Romans have left their mark on it in the Ridgeway or Ickleton Street, which runs along the edge of the Berkshire downs; and the eastern end of the vale was probably the scene of the struggle which decided the fate of Allectus¹. The great Alfred was born at Wantage. The battle of Æscesdun, in which the Danes were defeated by Ethelred and Alfred, and in which their king, Bagsæc, was slain, was fought a little to the east of Uffington².

Towards the north-west corner of this tract of country lie the house and village of Pusey. The house, which was built in the early part of the last century, is large and roomy but without any marked architectural merit. It commands a fine southern aspect, and beyond the trees and sheet of water, which are in the immediate foreground, the eye rests on the long line of the Downs which form the most prominent natural feature of the district. Away to the left, among the trees, is the parish church. The little village with its 117 inhabitants nestles for the most part close to the park wall and gate of the great house, whose owner is lord of the manor, and indeed the only landowner in the parish. The Pusey estate is much more extensive; it reaches from the Thames at Longworth to within three miles of Wantage³.

Pusey itself was, no doubt, originally an island⁴, at least in the sense of a place made difficult of access by some environment of water⁵. In Domesday Book it is written *Pesei*, or *Peise*, that is, probably *Peo's* or *Peot's* island.

¹ Coins of Allectus and Carausius are found, especially at Blewbury, but also in parishes further west.

² Until of late years the rude cutting in the turf of the Downs above Uffington, known as the White Horse, has been supposed to be a memorial of this battle.

³ Besides the parish of Pusey, the estate includes parts of several adjoining villages or hamlets, such as Charney-Basset, Lyford, the two Hanneys, Stanford, Goosey, Hatford, and Longworth. The Bouverie-Puseys have largely added by purchase to the property of the old family.

⁴ On the Thames below Faringdon are Binsey, Osney, Hinksey, Andresey (near Abingdon, 'Hist. Mon. Abing.', i. 474), Putney, Thorney, Bermondsey, &c.; while the Ock and its tribu-

tary streams have Charney, Hanney, Goosey, Childrey. In such a case as Childrey nothing more can have been meant than the protection afforded by a marsh created by the little stream. To the Saxons north of the Thames the great district of Surrey seemed to be the Southern Island. *Ley*, as distinct from *ei* or *ey*, denotes a meadow; as in Langley, Ifley, Radley, Streatley, Henley, &c.

⁵ Dr. Pusey used to say that Pusey is not 'in the vale' of Whitehorse, since it stands on higher ground, and was, until forty or more years ago, almost isolated by marshes. When the Hon. Philip Pusey went to Court, George III. asked him whether he did not live in the vale of Whitehorse. 'No, Sir,' was the reply; 'not in the vale, but just out of it.'

This 'island' was probably formed by the little stream which runs through the grounds attached to Pusey House, and finds its way into the Ock¹. Who Peot² was is unknown. He may have been a hermit who had found a safe retreat in an island surrounded by marshes. But the name of the place was already ancient at the date of the Conquest, and the place gave its name to the family, not the family to the place³.

Legend has woven a wreath round the early history of the family which for seven centuries bore the name and owned the estate of Pusey. And the handiwork of legend has been endorsed by learning and solidified by law. According to the tradition, when King Cnut was slowly breaking down the resistance of Ethelred the Unready he was encamped at Cherbury⁴, while the English were posted on the White Horse Hill, about seven miles distant. Disguised as a shepherd, one William Pewse, an officer of Cnut, gained admission to the English camp, and there discovered how and where an ambuscade had been formed, by which it was hoped effectually to arrest the course of the Danish conqueror. In gratitude for his escape, Cnut at once bestowed on Pewse and his heirs the neighbouring

¹ It is improbable that Peot's Island was formed by the marshes of the Thames; although, certainly, between Radcot Bridge and New Bridge the river forms by its arms a series of islands. In the thirteenth century Richard de Puseya acquired 'totum pratum quod vocatur Chetukesham (is this Quakenham?) quod est inter pratum de Longhurst, et Thamisiâ,' from the discreditable Abbot Adam of Eynsham, in exchange for 'totam piscariam suam in Thamisiâ, cum insulâ et brachiis ad dictam piscariam pertinentibus.' But Richard's ancestors were not at Pusey until the name of the place was ancient; had the name been furnished by an island on the Thames, it must have been shifted to the present village, which is at a distance of two or more miles. Pusey Furze, which lies between the river and the village, probably took its name from the latter.

² No early abbot of Abingdon bears this old Saxon name; Eynsham was only founded at the close of the tenth century. Peot may be Puis. Bishop Stubbs observes that there was an

Abbot Peot in Mercia (cf. Kemble, 'Cod. Diplom.', nos. 207-209) about A.D. 814 and an Abbot Pæga in the diocese of Worcester in A.D. 803. Peot may have also given his name to Peasemore in Berkshire. Roger Peot was a landowner at Shipton, Oxon, in Edward I.'s reign; Rot. Hundr., vol. ii. p. 739 A.

³ The family name is variously spelt. The first bearer of it is Henry de Pisi, Pisia. At the beginning of the thirteenth century we meet with Richard de Pesye, Peseya; later in this century with Henry de Peseya, Pesia, Pesye, Pesie, Pesya, Pusue, Puseye, Fusie. The form Pusey appears in the next century under Edward III. The horn shows that in the fifteenth century 'Pewse' had been adopted. 'Pewse' was sometimes misread 'Pecote,' as in the inscription on the tomb of Richard Pusey in 1655.

⁴ Cherbury Camp is about a mile and a quarter to the east of Pusey House. It is probably a British earthwork, but may have been occupied by Cnut in 1015 or 1016.

manor, which was to be held, after a fashion not uncommon in the eleventh century, by cornage, or the service of a horn¹. Of the truth of this story, Camden², writing under Elizabeth, had no doubt; and the horn received legal recognition, a century later, at the hands of Lord Chancellor Jeffreys³, when it was produced before him in the Court of Chancery. It is still treasured at Pusey. It is the horn of an ox, of average size, and is mounted in silver gilt, the workmanship of which, however, is of the fifteenth, not the eleventh century. It bears the inscription:—

Kyng Knowde geve Wylyyam Pewse
Thys horne to holde by thy londe.

But the objections to the historical worth of the story about Cnut's donation are decisive. At the conquest of England by William the Norman 'the men of Berkshire were specially loyal to Harold and to England,' and 'there are not many parts of the country in which the confiscation of property,' by the Conqueror, 'seems to have been more sweeping⁴.' There were three holdings in Pusey parish,

¹ When writing was a rare accomplishment, any weapon or utensil, remembered or attested to have belonged to a donor, warranted the holding of an estate ('*Archaeologia*,' vol. iii. p. 2, 1786). There is a good account and engraving of the horn, by which the Dean and Chapter of York have held the lands of Ulphus since the Conquest, in Drake's '*Hist. of the Cath. Ch. of York*,' 1736, p. 481. There were also charter-horns at Borstal in Bucks, at Carlisle Cathedral ('*Archaeologia*,' iii. 1-12, 15, 22), and at Hungerford, to which town John of Gaunt gave a bugle-horn, when he conceded the right of fishing in the Kennet (Lysons, '*Mag. Britt. Berks*,' p. 296). In '*Archaeologia*,' xii. pp. 397-399, there is an interesting paper on the Pusey horn by Dr. Pusey's half-uncle, the then (1790) Earl of Radnor.

² 'The family of Pusey still hold the manor by a horn anciently given to their ancestors by Canute the Danish king;' '*Britannia*,' ed. Gibson, 1722, p. 163. This work first appeared in 1586.

³ On Nov. 20, 1684, the horn was recovered in the Court of Chancery from another member of the family who

had possession of it by Richard Pusey, who held the estate. Vernon's '*Cases in Chancery*,' vol. i. p. 272: '*Pusey v. Pusey*. Bill was that a horn, which, time out of mind, had gone along with the plaintiff's estate, and was delivered to his ancestors in ancient time to hold their land by, might be delivered to him.' The Court, as reported, does not mention Canute; but Hickes seems to imply that its vaguer language was meant to do so. '*The-saurus*,' p. xxv: '*Regis Canuti qui praedium Puseyense tradito cornu dedisse fertur. Quod a majoribus de Pusey nuncupatis acceptum praedii dominus Carolus Pusey possidet. Id nimirum ante aliquot annos, cum Cancellariae praesideret Honorabilis Dominus Georgius Dom. Jefferyes, causâ in foro actâ, consecutus. In illâ lite, ut accepi, exhibitum in Cancellariâ fuit ipsummet cornu, de quo controversia erat; et cum magnâ omnium admiratione, ut illud ipsam cornu quo, veluti cartâ terras Puseyenses, ante DCC annos ferè, Canutus donaverat, acceptum, admissum et probatum.*'

⁴ Freeman's '*Norman Conquest*,' iv. 33, 34. See the whole vivid account of the confiscations in Berk-

and they all changed hands¹. The largest estate, belonging to Aluric, was given by William to his half-brother Odo, the fighting bishop of Bayeux²: under whom it was held by Roger de Iveri, the royal cup-bearer, the defender of Rouen against Robert³. A second and smaller manor which had belonged to two unnamed allodial holders, who were under no feudal lord⁴, was given to the great Norman abbey of Saint Pierre sur Dive⁵. A third manor at Pusey was one of the thirty which at that date the great abbey of Abingdon possessed in Berkshire alone. The abbey had to welcome a new Abbot⁶, but its property was respected, while the holders were changed. Alured, its English tenant at Pusey, was replaced by Gilbert the Norman⁷, who undertook for his holding⁸ to furnish one knight to the abbey, and to fight William's battles, if called on to do so. It is certain that no holder⁹ of land at Pusey remained undisturbed at the Conquest; and this is fatal

shire, pp. 32-42. The exceptions to this violent policy are discussed, *ib.* pp. 42-47.

¹ These changes were complete when the Domesday survey was made in 1086.

² On him see Freeman, 'Norman Conquest,' iii. 464.

³ Freeman, 'Norman Conquest,' iv. 643. He with his brother-in-arms, Robert of Oiley, founded the chapel of St. George in the Castle of Oxford. *Ib.* iv. 735, App. G.

⁴ Domesday, 59 B: 'Abbas de sup-diva tenet de rege Peise. Duo allodiarii tenuerunt, et potuerunt ire quo voluerunt.'

⁵ It was founded by Lescilina, widow of Count William of Eu; Freeman, 'Norman Conquest,' iii. 117; and the first abbot, Ainard, was appointed A.D. 1046; *ib.* iv. 93. The church had been consecrated more recently, in the presence of the Conqueror, on St. Philip and St. James' Day, 1067; Ord. Vit. 507 A, qu. by Freeman, 'Norman Conquest,' iv. 93. The church was dedicated to the Blessed Virgin, and this dedication gradually extended itself to the abbey. In a charter of Henry I. dated 1108, it is styled 'Abbatia Beatae Mariae de Sancto Petro supra Divam'; 'Gallia Christiana,' vol. xi. app., p. 156, B. Lysons mistakenly writes 'super Dinam'; 'Mag. Britt.' i. 326. The

traveller along the road from Caen to Falaise still takes note of the noble tower of this church as the most striking object in the landscape; 'Norman Conquest,' iii. 117.

⁶ Abbot Ealdred, who had submitted to the Conqueror (Dugd. 'Mon. Angl.,' i. 507, ed. Ellis), had nevertheless, in 1071, to make way for Abbot Athelhelm, who was imported from Jumièges in Normandy. It must be remembered that the old tenants of the abbey zealously resisted the new government, long after William's accession (Freeman, 'Norman Conquest,' iv. 33, who quotes 'Chron. Mon. Abendon.' i. 486, 493).

⁷ Domesday, 59 B.

⁸ 'Chron. Mon. Abend.' ii. 5. Gilbert also held land under the Abbye on the Moor, and at Draycote and Lockinge. The estate at Pusey belonging to the Abbey is mentioned in a Bull of Eugenius III., A.D. 1146 ('Chron. Mon. Abend.' ii. 192), and still later (*ib.* p. 311) as 'two hides.'

⁹ Osney Abbey only acquired its property at Pusey in 1189; Ann. Mon. de Osneia in 'Ann. Mon.' iv. p. 43, ed. Luard. In the Taxatio ecclesiastica Angliae et Walliae, auctoritate P. Nicolai IV., circa A.D. 1291 (Lond. 1802), p. 187, is the entry, 'Pensio abbatis de Osneye in ecclesiâ de Puseye, £2. 13. 4, decima. £0. 5. 4.'

to the particular claim of antiquity ascribed since the fifteenth century to the horn and its historical associations.

But it seems to be at least possible¹ that Gilbert, the new Norman tenant under the abbey, took the name of the estate, and is the ancestor of the Puseys. He would naturally be glad to link himself in this way with the spot on which he lived, and so to enable his poor English neighbours the more readily to forget the share he had had in the work of the Conqueror. In the middle of the next century his son or grandson calls himself *de Pisi* or *de Pisia*²; and he may have held his lands of the abbey by the present Pusey horn³. In course of time the Puseys acquired property of their own⁴; and as the confiscations of the Conquest faded from memory, while the country people still cherished traditions of the struggle of the English and the Danes, one such tradition gradually connected the horn with King Cnut, and by the fifteenth century it was sufficiently venerable to be engraved on the silver setting of the horn. The germ of truth in the story was that the first Pusey had held his lands at the pleasure of a foreign conqueror.

The Puseys can be traced in existing documents from the beginning of the thirteenth to the middle of the eighteenth century, although the materials do not suffice to construct a complete genealogy of the family⁵. The Puseys of the thirteenth century appear to have been wealthier and more enterprising than their successors. They went to law⁶;

¹ See Clarke's '*Parochial Topography of the Hundred of Wanting*,' Oxford, 1824, p. 27.

² Henry *de Pisi* or *de Pisia* occurs in 1156 among the witnesses to documents conveying land or tithes to the church of Abingdon ('*Chron. Mon. Abendon.*' ii. 191 and 211). The dependants of the abbey would be the natural witnesses of such documents; and if one of them belonged to Pusey he would be the tenant on the abbey farm there.

³ According to the '*Liber Niger Scaccarii*,' vol. i. p. 181, ed. Hearne, Oxford, 1728, Henry *de Pesca* held one knight's fee from the Abbey of Abingdon '*de veteri feofamento*,' which Clarke ('*Par. Topogr.*' *ubi supr.*) explains to mean from the reign of Henry I.

⁴ The Abbey of Abingdon still held the overlordship of some property at Pusey at the Dissolution; Abstract of Roll, 30 Henry VIII., Augmentation Office, quoted in Dugdale, '*Monasticon Anglicanum*,' i. 530, ed. Ellis.

⁵ Throughout the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, their Christian names are Richard and Henry; in the fifteenth, John and Thomas, and at the close William and Philip; the earlier names reappear at a later date.

⁶ Under King John, in 1204, Richard *de Pesye* and Amy his wife were successful plaintiffs in a suit at Westminster to recover some land at Colerugge, a manor in the parish of Hampstead Norris.

they sold¹, and they bought²; and they 'did well' on the whole by these transactions, in the sense of bettering their position. Sir Henry de Pesya is the most prominent member of the family in the middle ages: he was coroner for the town of Abingdon³, and was a man of wealth.

The life of the Puseys during the next four centuries and a half is that of quiet country gentlemen. They had relations with the Frankelyns at Pusey and the Hammonds at Buckland; they were long overshadowed by the more wealthy and powerful Fettiplaces⁴. Under Edward IV., one Pusey was a teacher of Civil Law at Oxford⁵; under Elizabeth, another was in the Commission of the Peace for Berkshire⁶,—an appointment which would imply that they had acquiesced in the Reformation. Whether they profited when St. Peter on the Dive surrendered its estate to Henry V. in 1415⁷, or by the secularization of the properties of Abingdon and Osney Abbeys at the Dissolution in the succeeding century, we do not know. They do not appear at any time to have contributed a sheriff or a knight of the shire to the county of Berkshire. They belonged to that unenterprising and unambitious but useful class of the English gentry which is satisfied to hold its own; never rising into the ranks of the nobility; never sinking into the peasantry; but having a recognized place and status in the country; a station made honourable by long occupancy, and by the quiet and unostentatious discharge of local duties.

In the great struggle of the seventeenth century, the

¹ Richard de Pesye sold his island and fishing on the upper Thames for the meadow Chetukesham (Quakenham), to the Abbot Adam of Eynsham, that 'manifest perjurer and dilapidator,' who was deposed by St. Hugh of Lincoln, June 1, 1228. 'Ann. de Dunstaphiâ,' p. 109; 'Ann. de Theokesberia,' p. 70.

² Under Henry III., Sir Henry de Peseya acquired property in 'the town of Pesye' from Geoffrey de Fraunkelayn; in the great East Street of Abingdon, from Hugh the merchant; in Buckland, from Richard Doget, commonly called Richard the Fool. A tombstone to Henry Dogett, who died Aug. 12, 1480, exists in Pusey Church; it was removed from the earlier building in 1745.

³ 'Rotuli Hundredorum,' London, 1812, vol. 1, p. 19, where there is an

account of Sir Henry's proceedings after a murder at Abingdon, A.D. 1276.

⁴ The Fettiplaces had been at Denchworth since 1264. In the sixteenth century they still owned a great part of Pusey. In that century William Pusey married Eleanor, daughter of Antony Fettiplace, of North Denchworth.

⁵ John de Pese, 'Munimenta Academica, ii. 687-9. Under 'expositio cautionum pro aulis' we find, 'pro magnis scholis juris civilis, magister J. Pese.' He must not be identified with Johannes Pese of the 'Greek Hall,' and 'St. John's Hall, in St. Aldate's Parish.'

⁶ Hugh Pusey, of Pusey, in 1601. Cf. Clarke's 'Hundred of Wanting,' p. 13.

⁷ Rymer's 'Foedera,' ix. 280.

Puseys must have found it difficult to keep on good terms with their neighbours. Faringdon was a stronghold of loyal feeling; in 1645 Cromwell himself had been repulsed by the townsfolk, under brave Roger Burgess¹. The Fettiplaces, who had land at Pusey, and with whom the Puseys had now for three generations been connected by marriage, were strongly loyalist². On the other hand the Dunches, who also had property at Pusey, were strong Parliamentarians, and were connected by marriage with the Protector³. At Longworth lived no less a person than Harry Marten the regicide⁴: and, some miles further north at Bessilsleigh, William Lenthall, Cromwell's friend and correspondent, Speaker of the House of Commons during the Long Parliament⁵. Richard Pusey, the head of the family, appears to have accepted the Parliamentary and Puritan *régime* with equanimity; and to have lived for five years under the Restoration. His son Richard, who died ten years before his father, was a Fifth Monarchy man; his death possibly saved him from the severities of the Protector⁶. Richard, the son of Richard, the Fifth

¹ See the vivid account in Carlyle, 'Cromwell,' i. 183. Burgess fortified the ancient mansion that overlooked the Thames; it was only taken after a siege of 55 days in June, 1646.

² John Fettiplace, of Childrey, who sat for Berkshire four times in Parliament (Clarke's 'Hundred of Wanting,' p. 44), had to pay heavily for his loyalty, and was made a Baronet at the Restoration (*ibid.* p. 67; Lysons, 'Magn. Britt.' i. 260).

³ John Dunch married Ann Mayor, of Hursley, sister to the wife of Richard Cromwell. His father, Edmund Dunch, had been Sheriff of Berkshire. He sat for the county three times, and again for Wallingford in the Long Parliament. John Dunch himself sat in Cromwell's Parliaments of 1654 and 1656 (Carlyle's 'Cromwell,' iii. 144, iv. 18). He is the collector of seventeen letters of Cromwell, one addressed to himself (*ibid.* ii. 96, v. 78). His accomplished son, Mayor Dunch, died in 1679, aged 29. His monument is in the north transept of Pusey Church, as also is that of his son Wharton Dunch, who died unmarried in 1705 at the age of 27.

⁴ He was son of the great civilian, Sir Henry Marten, Dean of

the Arches, and Judge of the Prerogative Court and Court of Admiralty. Sir Henry died in 1641 (Archbishop Laud's 'History of Troubles and Trial,' Works, iii. 450). Harry Marten sat for Berkshire in two of Charles's Parliaments, as the colleague of John Fettiplace. He squandered the fortune which his father had accumulated; alienated the manor of Longworth; signed the King's death-warrant; and was one of the forty-one persons to whom executive power was entrusted on the King's demise (Carlyle's 'Cromwell,' ii. 95). His dissolute character provoked Cromwell's scorn when dissolving the Long Parliament in 1653 (*ibid.* iii. 195). Carlyle calls him 'an indomitable little Roman pagan' (*ibid.* iii. 168). At the Restoration he was tried as a regicide, and died in prison at Chepstow Castle, A.D. 1680. His wife and child are buried at Longworth; the manor now forms part of the Pusey property, and the Marten aisle is kept in repair by Mr. Pusey. (See also Lysons, 'Magn. Britt.' i. 314.)

⁵ Lenthall had purchased the house at Bessilsleigh from the Fettiplaces.

⁶ Richard Pusey, the son, is buried under the wall of the south transept of

Monarchy man, was a boy of fifteen when his grandfather died in 1665¹. On his own death in 1702 he was succeeded by his only surviving son Charles, who died childless in 1710, bequeathing his estate to his sister's son, John Allen². John Allen took the name of Pusey, and lived on his property for forty-three years. He married Jane, the eldest daughter of Sir William Bouverie, Bart., and sister of the first Viscount Folkestone, a marriage which controlled in the event the destiny of the estates and name of Pusey. Mr. Allen Pusey was a man of strong religious interests. In 1745, three years after his wife's death, he rebuilt on its present site³ the Parish Church of All Saints, at Pusey⁴, in a style which was demanded by the taste of the eighteenth century⁵. While he lived he added some new ornament to it each year. He looked upon it as a memorial of his wife, who lies interred under an imposing monument in the south transept. Eleven years after her death, in November, 1753, he was laid at her side.

Mr. John Allen Pusey left two sisters, Elizabeth, the wife of William Brotherton, Esq., and Miss Jane Allen Pusey, who succeeded on his death to the Pusey estate⁶. Mrs. Brotherton survived her brother only four years⁷: her memory is preserved at Pusey in a Greek temple on the south-west side of the house, which her husband erected to her memory⁸, and in which Edward Bouverie Pusey and his brother, when little boys, used to play on wet days.

the Parish Church at Pusey. The inscription runs thus: 'Richard Pusey, alias Pesey, Pecote, having in his lifetime received whole Christ, that is, not only as Prophet and Priest, but as Lord and King too, in this true justifying faith, died most comfortably August 2, A.D. 1655. *Ætatis* 34. *Relicta* Maria p. Junii 30, 1656.' Cromwell denounced this 'effort to bring in confusion' which the Fifth Monarchy men were making, in his speech in Parliament, September 4, 1654 (Carlyle's 'Cromwell,' iv. p. 27 sqq.). Richard Pusey may have heard of this menace; he had been dead a year and eight months when the Mile End Green rising of April 9, 1657, was suppressed (*ibid.* iv. 259).

¹ He brought the lawsuit about the horn before Lord Chancellor Jeffreys. (See p. 452 *supra*.)

² Miss Pusey had married into the

family of the Allens of Basildon and Streatley.

³ The old church, which had fallen into decay through long neglect, stood near to Pusey House.

⁴ Brit. Mus. MSS. 9410

⁵ The monuments of the Doggatts, the Dunches, and the Puseys were removed to the modern building from the old Gothic church.

⁶ Mr. Charles Pusey's sisters had died without issue.

⁷ She was buried December 21, 1757.

⁸ In the centre of this temple is a statue of Mrs. Brotherton, with the inscription, 'Sacrum conjugi pariter et amicae, amoris longoevi, fidei inviolatae, constantiae insolitae, virtutisque quidquid est humanioris, monumentum hoc et exemplar posuit Gulielmus Brotherton, 1759.'

Miss Jane Allen Pusey lived for thirty-two years after her sister: she took brevet rank, and was generally known as Mrs. Allen. She spent much of her time on her estate in Gloucestershire, and only died in the year of the French Revolution, 1789¹. She was the last of the old family of the Puseys.

It was through the action of these ladies, the sisters of John Allen Pusey, and the nieces of Charles Pusey, that the Pusey estate passed into the hands of the Bouveries. Both ladies had been equally attached to their sister-in-law, Jane Allen Pusey; a person whose character appears to have won the respect and affection of all who knew her. Having no direct heirs, they turned their thoughts towards the relatives of this much loved sister, and especially to the Hon. Philip Bouverie, the youngest son of her brother, Viscount Folkestone. At Mrs. Brotherton's death he was a boy of eleven years of age. The sisters had already decided that on coming of age Philip Bouverie was to live six months at Pusey, and six months on their estate in Gloucestershire, and make up his mind which he preferred. The home of his choice would be lent to him, until the death of the surviving sister, and would then become his property. This generous offer was accepted. The Hon. Philip Bouverie first resided at Pusey in 1767. He was so delighted with the place that he did not care to visit the estate in Gloucestershire. On April 3, 1784, he exchanged the surname of Bouverie for that of Pusey, and five years later became the owner of the Pusey property.

When in his later years the subject of this memoir was politely apologizing for not accepting some proposal of which his better judgment disapproved, he would say with a smile, 'You know I am phlegmatic, and indeed Dutch.' He was in fact by descent a French Walloon: his paternal ancestors came from the borderland between France and Flanders. Their name Bouverie was the natural product of the life of primitive men devoted to herding and tending cattle²: more than one head of a family would have been known by the ox-shed, which was the scene and symbol of

¹ Clarke's, 'Hundred of Wanting,' p. 27.

² Bouverie, literally ox-stall: as Vacquerie, cowstall. Among the parties to the treaty of Arras, there is a Jehan de la Vacquerie on each side; 'Chron. de J. Molinet,' ed. Buchon, pp. 316-317; 'Recueil général des an-

ciennes lois françaises,' t. x. p. 877, Paris, 1825. Long after their migration to England the Bouveries called themselves De Bouverie, De la Bouverie, Des Bouveries, and Des Bouverie. When the Crown enrolled them it settled the question by adopting the simple word Bouverie.

his daily toil. Bouverie is still a common name both of places¹ and persons² in the Walloon districts of Belgium. But it is especially associated with Liège³ and Bruges⁴, where streets, gates, sepulchral chapels, bridges, nay large districts, once attested or still witness to the ancient splendour and importance of the Bouveries. The same conclusion is established by tombs⁵, testamentary bequests⁶, and civic archives⁷.

At Liège the Bouveries had a long and hereditary connexion with the municipal life of that most turbulent of Walloon cities. The earliest recorded bearer of the name is Jean Boucher de la Bouverie, who was living in 1320⁸. He and his descendants rose to fortune, at least largely, by their marriages. He married a sister of Waleran de Juprelle, the best esquire, says Henricourt, of his day in Hesbaye. His son Waleran married Marguerite, daughter of Henri d'Arvens, the 'fairest young lady in Hesbaye'⁹. His grandsons were both leading men in Liège. Engelbert, the younger,

¹ In the province of Liège Bouverie is a 'dépendance de la ville de Liège,' a 'dépendance de la commune de Seneffe,' and a 'dépendance de la commune de Polleur'; 'Dict. Géogr. de la Province de Liège,' par Vanden Maelen, Bruxelles, 1831, p. 33. The commune of Bouverie lies in the densely-populated coal district of the valley of the Sambre, about four miles S.W. of Mons; cf. Reclus, 'Nouvelle Géographie Universelle,' iv. 121.

² It is now generally written Bouvry. The present, or late, Vicar-General of Tournai owns this name.

³ The most prominent bridge over the Meuse is Bouverie Bridge. A large district of the city bears the name. In the church of the Carmelites destroyed at the Revolution, there was a fine Bouverie chapel; cf. Knebel Heraldique des Bourgeois de la noble Cité de Liège, Liège, 1720, pp. 94 and 160.

⁴ At Bruges the Rue de la Bouverie runs S.W. from the railway station to the gate of the Porte de la Bouverie. This historical gate was erected in 1367. Fifty years ago its ruins still existed. In 1801 a new gate was erected under Napoleon I.; it was demolished in 1863. Duclos, 'Bruges,' pp. 235, 237; cf. 'Collection de Chroniques Belges Inédites,' 'Chronique de Brabant et

de Flandre,' ed. Piot, 1879; 'Vlaamse Kronyk,' p. 200, for the 'Bouverye poorte.'

⁵ Thus the Bouverie escutcheon occurs on the tomb of Werner Dominique de Menzet, Provost of Notre Dame, at Bruges. He died in 1725, and is buried close to the south wall in the chapel of the Holy Sacrament in that church; 'Inscriptions Funéraires et Monumentales de la Flandre Occidentale,' par J. Gaillard, tom. i. part 2, p. 99.

⁶ Thus Jan Bouverys is mentioned in a document describing the gifts of the chaplain Jean de Vliete to Notre Dame at Bruges; 'Inscriptions,' &c., u. s., p. 480, note.

⁷ The 'Inventaire des Archives de Bruges,' published by M. Gaillard, abounds in allusions to Jean de la Bouverie; cf. tom. vi. pp. 31, 134, 145, 150, 153, 162, 166, 184. For these references I am indebted to the courtesy of the accomplished editor.

⁸ Henricourt, 'Miroir des nobles de la Hesbaye,' pp. 109, 144, 281, ap.; Herckenrode, 'Collection de Tombes, epitaphes et Blasons de la Hesbaye,' Gand, 1845; Le Fort, 'MS. Généalogiques, Archives d'Etat,' Liège, vol. iv. fol. 89.

⁹ Waleran de la Bouverie was living in 1342.

was first Canon and then Dean of the Collegiate Church of St. Martin on the Mount¹. Jean Buchard de la Bouverie, the elder brother, was burgomaster in 1382. In 1389 he was deputed by his fellow-citizens to undertake an important mission to Rome²; in 1390 he was 'grand Bailiff of the Cathedral and sovereign Mayor³.' By a second marriage⁴ he became the father of Bertrand de la Bouverie; and he died in 1399⁵. Bertrand was an esquire⁶ in the princely house of Robert of Namur⁷; and upon Robert's death Bertrand wooed and won his widow, Isabeau de Melun⁸. Disregarding the remonstrances of her late husband's family⁹ and of her own, she enabled Bertrand de la Bouverie to raise his family to an unprecedented prosperity¹⁰ and became the mother of five children by him. Her eldest son, Jean, was Mayor of Liège in 1430: he must have witnessed that serious effort to throw off the authority of Bishop John of Heinsberg, which, after a temporary success, ended in scenes of ruin and massacre.

¹ Le Fort, 'MSS. Genéalogiques,' p. 90.

² The object of this mission was to obtain the Pope's consent to the election of Théodore de la Marck to the vacant bishopric. John of Bavaria was chosen; and Jean de la Bouverie must have witnessed the early administration of that frivolous and profligate youth. 'Historia Leodensis per episcoporum et principum seriem digesta,' auctore R. P. Foulton, Leod. 1735, vol. i. pp. 452, 454 sqq.; 'Histoire du pays de Liège,' par F. Tychon, Liège, 1866, p. 111.

³ Le Fort, p. 90.

⁴ To Marie Blanche de la Monzée.

⁵ Jean Buchard founded the Bouverie Chapel in the Carmelite Church at Liège. The inscription on his tomb ran: 'Chy giest Messire Johan Buchard del Boverie, chevalier, ki trepassa l'an 1399, la nuit du S. Sacrament;' 'Recueil Herald. des Bourguemestres de Liège,' p. 95.

⁶ Butkens, 'Trophées de Brabant,' i. 445, 'escuier de sa maison'; Le Fort, u. s.

⁷ He was Lord of Beaufort, the ruins of which castle form a striking object on the right bank of the Meuse, a little above Huy. The castle was destroyed by the French in 1551.

⁸ Her father was Hughes, Viscount

of Ghent, Lord of Antoing, Espinoy, and Sollenghien; her mother was Marguerite of Picquigny. She was Lady of Viane, near Grammont, and of Renay in Flanders, as well as of Beaufort on the Meuse.

⁹ The story, however, that she was 'ransomed' from her engagement by her brother-in-law, John of Namur, is groundless; Henricourt, 'Miroir des nobles de la Hesbaye,' p. 209. It is possible that her castle of Beaufort was bought by her husband's family. It does not appear to have belonged to the Bouveries.

¹⁰ On the tomb of Isabeau's daughter Jane, who married the cup-bearer to the Dauphin, John de Haynim, died in 1479, and was buried at Henin, near Bossut, in Hainaut, the arms of the Bouveries were quartered with those of Melun. The chapel of N. Dame de la Fontaine, in which this tomb existed, was destroyed by the French revolutionary army. A small modern building of no interest marks the spot; Collins, 'Peerage' (ed. Brydges), v. 29. The quarterings on the tomb are preserved in a MS. of the Bibl. Roy. at Brussels, no. 19534; 'Quartiers généalogiques des dames, abbesses, et chanoinesses, de S. Aldegonde à Maubeuge,' Gand, 1799, p. 23.

Her second son, another Jean, who succeeded to the great family estates on his brother's death, and was four times¹ burgomaster, lived through the most stirring years of the history of the city. The opposition of the Liegeois to the dissipated and worthless Louis of Bourbon, nephew of Philip, Duke of Burgundy, who had been placed in the see vacated by the forced resignation of John of Heinsberg, drew down upon the citizens the vengeance of the Burgundians². After the battle of Brusthem, in 1467, Liège lay at the mercy of Charles the Bold. Jean de la Bouverie had taken a leading part in the resistance to the Burgundians; and he was at the head of the deputation which endeavoured to secure moderate terms from the conqueror³. Liège was roused by the perfidy of Louis XI. to revolt against the Burgundians; and, after its capture on October 30, 1468, forty thousand citizens were massacred, the town was deserted, and with the exception of the cathedral, some churches and ecclesiastical buildings, it was laid in ruins. On the death of Charles the Bold in 1477, Mary of Burgundy restored to the city some of its lost privileges. Jean de la Bouverie had fled on the eve of the Burgundian triumph; he returned to take part in the famous procession which brought back from Bruges to Liège the Perron, or monumental column, carried off by the conquerors in 1467⁴. The last year of Jean's office as burgomaster, 1482, was that in which Louis of Bourbon was killed by William de la Marck, the Wild Boar of Ardennes: Jean probably witnessed the treacherous capture and execution of De la Marck himself by the successor of his victim, three years later. The exact date of Jean de la Bouverie's death is uncertain: he was buried in the Bouverie Chapel at the Carmelite Church of Liège⁵.

¹ In 1455, 1460, 1465, and 1482; 'Histoire de la Ville et Pays de Liège,' par le R. P. Th. Bouille, Liège, 1731, t. iii. pp. 41, 57, 77, 194.

² Foullon, 'Historia Leodiensis,' ii. 54 sq.; Tychon, p. 129.

³ Foullon, ii. 112; Verviers, 'Notices Historiques sur le pays de Liège,' 1883, p. 380.

⁴ 'Recueil Heraldiques des Bourguemestres de Liège,' p. 188; Foullon, 'Hist. Leod.' ii. 115, 150.

⁵ 'Recueil Heraldique des Bourguemestres de la noble Cité de Liège,' Liège, 1720, p. 160. The inscription,

written by his great-grandson a century after his death, runs as follows: 'En memoire de Noble et Honoré Seigneur Messire Jean del Boverie, Chevalier, Haut-voüé hereditaire de Liege, Seigneur de Viane en Flandre, Beadegny, et de la Chapelle, de madame Jenne le Panetiere sa conjointe, d'Adrien leur fils, et de Damoiselle Marguerite de Marnef sa femme, de Damoiselle Marie leur fille, et de Johan le Pollain de Xhenemont, dit Corbeau, son mari, Adrien le Pollain leur fils, jadis Mambour-General des Reverendissimes Princes George d'Austriche, de Berghes,

In Jean de la Bouverie this branch of the race attained its greatest prominence. His son Adrian was living in 1510: his grandson, another Adrian, in 1515. They saw Everard de la Marck, nephew of the 'Wild Boar,' on the episcopal throne of Liège: the younger Adrian may have witnessed that prelate's struggle with the first effects of Lutheranism in his diocese. The race of Jean de la Bouverie was continued by his daughter Mary, who married Jean le Pollain de Xhenemont. Their eldest son died in exile, probably on account of adherence to the Reformed opinions; their second son Adrian took the name of de la Bouverie, and through him it was perpetuated to very recent times.

At Bruges the Bouveries played a very different part from that of their connexions¹ at Liège. We know the names of only two of the family at Bruges; but of these one fills a greater place in history than any at Liège, and they were both men of the Court, not men of the people; they were servants of the great dukes of Burgundy. Thus the two branches of the family were on opposite sides during the struggle between the power of Burgundy and the cities of the Low Countries in the latter half of the fifteenth century. After the bloody field of Gavre², by which the House of Burgundy established its influence in Flanders, the older branch of the Bouveries, like other Walloon families, passed into the service of the Duke. In 1460, Robert de la Bouverie presided over³ the office of rates and taxes at the Court of Philip the Good: and immediately before Philip's death Robert's greater son, Jean de la Bouverie, had been appointed to an important commission⁴. On the accession of Charles the Bold, Jean de la Bouverie soon found himself in an influential position

et de Groesbech et présentement grand Greffier de cette cité l'an 1599 a fait cette reparation.'

¹ The families of Bruges and Liège have the same armorial bearings, and the same family names; Collins, 'Peerage,' ed. Brydges, v. 29, even identifies Jean de la Bouverie of Bruges with Jean de la Bouverie of Liège; as indeed does the author of an *Histoire du Conseil de Brabant*, MS. 9937, p. 11, in Bibl. Roy. de Bruxelles. Collins relies on the identity of their escutcheons, without noticing the distinctness of their

estates. Jean de la Bouverie of Bruges was Lord of Bierbecque, near Louvain, and Wierre, or Weert, near Lille. His namesake at Liège was Lord of Viane, near Grammont, in Flanders, of Bealdegnes and La Chapelle.

² A. D. 1452; cf. Kitchin, 'History of France,' i. 555.

³ Butkens, iii. Suppl. Liv. vii. p. 203, 'Recueil de quelques receveurs généraux des domaines et finances.' Philip the Good died in 1467.

⁴ MS. notes de Marius Voet, bourgmestre de Bruges mort en 1685, Bibl. Roy. Brussels, MS. 21757, p. 54.

on the new Privy Council of State¹, and he was the second² president of the Court of Parliament which Charles summoned to meet at Malines in 1473, discharging in it the duties of a Chancellor of the Exchequer. This Parliament became unpopular: it does not appear to have outlived Charles himself: but the fortunes of Jean de la Bouverie were independent of it. We know not indeed what had been his influence on his self-willed and passionate master; or how he bore the tidings of the fight at Morat³, or of that tragic scene, six months later, when the body of the last Duke of Burgundy was found in a swamp outside the walls of Nancy, naked, frozen, and covered with wounds⁴. Charles's daughter, Mary of Burgundy, a maiden of twenty years, surrounded by enemies and suitors, had Jean de la Bouverie as president of her Council⁵, and it was probably by his advice that she bestowed her hand and her fortunes on Maximilian of Austria⁶. This marriage, so full of consequences for France and for Europe, was also important for the man who had promoted it: and Jean de la Bouverie became the trusted friend of the heir of the Holy Roman Empire, and a Knight of the Order of the Golden Fleece⁷. In less than four years after her wedding, Mary was killed by a fall from her Scotch pony⁸: she lies at her father's side in Notre Dame at Bruges. Six months after her death Maximilian appointed Jean de la Bouverie to the Chancellorship of Brabant⁹,—the crown of a career at the Burgundian Court¹⁰. In this capacity he represented Maximilian at St. Quentin and at Arras¹¹ in those important

¹ Conseillier et procureur general, Bibl. Roy. Brussels, MS. 9937, p. 11. This council was created in 1467.

² So MS. 9937, p. 11, Bibl. Roy. Brussels. The print in Montfaucon, 'Monumens de la Monarchie Française,' iii. 349, makes him the third president.

³ June 21, 1476.

⁴ January 4, 1477; Kitchin, 'History of France,' ii. 85.

⁵ 'Trophées de Brabant,' Suppl., tom. i. 46, quoted by Collins.

⁶ They were married on May 27, 1477.

⁷ For his investiture with the order, in the Church of St. Sauveur at Bruges, on April 30, 1478, see 'Vlaamsche Kronyk,' pp. 243, 244; 'Histoire de l'ordre de la Toison d'Or,' par le Baron de Reiffenberg,

Bruxelles, 1830, p. 91. When Maximilian had been admitted, 'l'évêque de Tournay, chancelier de l'ordre, célébra la grande messe, pendant laquelle le souverain arma chevalier le président de son grand conseil.' See the note on these last words, and Butkens, 'Trophées,' &c., ii. 364, and Suppl., ii. 302.

⁸ 'Mem. de Comynes,' ii. 222, ed. 1843; cf. note on 'hobin.' Her death occurred on March 27, 1481.

⁹ Butkens, 'Trophées,' ii. 359-381, 364. Bibl. Roy. Brussels. MS. 9937, p. 11. Jean is not the only chancellor whose name is omitted in Loyens; 'Tractatus de Curia Brabantiae,' Bruxelles, 1667.

¹⁰ Butkens, 'Trophées,' ii. 356, § Du Chancellier de Brabant.

¹¹ 'Mem. de Comynes,' v. 243, ed.

negotiations which, by betrothing the infant daughter of Maximilian and Mary to the Dauphin, cemented a firm peace between France and Austria, and ended the long struggle of the French for a better northern frontier¹.

Jean de la Bouverie resigned the Chancellorship in 1483; and from this date his name disappears from history. Whether he witnessed the rebellion of Bruges against the Archduke Maximilian in 1488, and the heavy penalties inflicted on the town on its submission in 1490, from which it never wholly recovered², it is impossible to decide. But the absence of any information of the death and burial-place of so considerable a man³ suggests that, in consequence of events connected with the revolt of Bruges, he died in exile.

Certainly the Bouveries were important people elsewhere. They had a place and name at Cambray⁴: but they were also prominent at Angers on the Loire. It is probable that when in 1472 Philip de Comines exchanged the service of the Duke of Burgundy for that of the King of France, who endowed him with an estate near Angers⁵, he had in his train one or more members of the Bouverie family. Jean Bouverie filled important positions in the municipal life of Angers⁶; and by his marriage with the sister of Poyet, the unfortunate Chancellor of France⁷, he was the father of Gabriel, who became successively tutor to François de Valois, Duke of Alençon⁸, then Abbot of St. Nicholas, near Angers; Abbot of St. Cyprian at Poitiers⁹, and finally

Godefroy, Bruxelles, 1723. At p. 273 the full text of the treaty of Arras is given. It was signed Dec. 25, 1482, and among others by Jehan de la Bouverie, sieur de Bierbeque et de Wierre, chancelier de Brabant, on behalf of Maximilian. Neither the instructions to J. de la Bouverie nor the text of the treaty occur in the original of Comines; they are supplied by Godefroy, who had access to the documents. Compare Dupont's edition of 'Commynes,' 1840, for the Soc. de l'Hist. de France, and the full text of the treaty in 'Recueil Général des anciennes lois françaises,' tom. x. pp. 876 sqq., Paris, 1825.

¹ Kitchin, 'History of France,' ii. 95.

² 'Délices des Pays Bas,' 1769, tom. ii. p. 367.

³ Butkens, ii. 364, says also, 'de

sa posterité n'ay je information suffisante pour en dire quelque chose.' This alone shows that he was a distinct person from J. de la Bouverie of Liège, cf. p. 461.

⁴ 'Histoire de Cambray et du Cambrésis,' par J. Le Carpentier, 1664; qu. by Smiles, 'Huguenots,' p. 320.

⁵ 'Mem. de Comines,' ed. Godefroy, Lond. 1747, vol. iv. pp. 2 and 129 sqq., where the charter of the French king is given.

⁶ In 1487 he was 'conseiller echevin perpetuel de la ville d'Angers, (Bodin, 'Recherches Historiques sur l'Anjou et ses monumens,' Saumur, 1823, vol. ii. p. 583); and again in 1504 (ibid.); Mayor in 1512 (ibid. p. 575).

⁷ Ibid. 530.

⁸ Ibid. 117.

⁹ 'Gallia Christiana,' xiv. 680.

Bishop of Angers¹, in which capacity he was present at the last three sessions of the Council of Trent, held under Pius IV. in 1563².

Bishop Gabriel Bouverie seems to have been a studious and self-denying man³, especially bent on raising the tone of his clergy⁴: he died on Feb. 10, 1572. Another member of the family, Nicolas Bouverie, who had succeeded the Bishop as Abbot of St. Cyprian's, became Treasurer and Canon of Angers Cathedral in 1577⁵.

It is highly probable that a branch of the Bouverie family which, at the beginning of the sixteenth century, was settled at Sainghin⁶ in Melantois, about six miles to the south-east of Lille, was related to the Bouveries of Bruges⁷. Sainghin is now a French village⁸: but a great part of its old Walloon church still stands, and not far from it are the sites of two châteaux, which were probably destroyed in 1667 when Lille, after being besieged by Louis XIV., passed with the adjoining district into the possession of France. Of these châteaux the larger was a fief held by the family of De la Douve, who had acquired it by marriage in 1458⁹. The smaller château stood in what is now

¹ 'Gallia Christiana,' xiv. 584.

² Ibid. An absurd story of the outrages offered to the bishop by the suite of his old pupil the Duc d'Alençon, at an entertainment given to the duke by the bishop, is related in Bodin, ii. 117.

³ His portrait at Longford Castle, Wilts, presents a pale and somewhat emaciated countenance, a broad forehead, the lower part of the face contracted, thin and compressed lips. He is habited in surplice, tippet, biretta, and ring. Underneath is inscribed, 'Gabriel Bouvry, cum in pont^{ificatus} dignitate vixisset annos XXXII obiit x Feb. A. D. MDLXXII. aetatis suae LXVI. Hospes quid sit vides, quid fuerit nosti, futurus ipse quid sis, cogita.'

⁴ He wrote a Catechism; a Guide des Curés; and he translated St. Gregory, 'De Curâ Pastoralî'; Bodin, ii. 506.

⁵ 'Gallia Christiana,' xiv. 713. The château belonging to the family still exists as a ruin in the department of the Sarthe. It is lithographed in Victor Petit's 'Châteaux de France des xv et xvi siècles.'

⁶ Called Syngin in a diploma of Lothaire, A. D. 972, confirming the

possessions of the Abbey of St. Quentin in Lille; Senghin in 1131; Sainghin in 1341 (cf. 'Statistique Archéologique du département du Nord,' 1^{re} partie, Lille et Paris, 1867, p. 23); St. Gain in the registers of the Walloon church at Canterbury; Sainctgin in Blaeu's 'Théâtre du Monde,' Amst. 1650, map 99.

⁷ Jean de la Bouverie's Castle of Wierre was at no great distance: although near Wierre is a Saineghin, not to be confounded with Sainghin-en-Melantois.

⁸ The lord of Sainghin was a viscount in the marquisate of Roubaix. 'Statistique Archéolog. p. 846: 'Seigneurie vicontière tenu en fief du marquisat de Roubaix.' Ecclesiastically Sainghin was in the diocese of Tournai; an arrangement which lasted for a century and a quarter after its annexation to France. It is now in the diocese of Arras. Even its river, the Deule, connects it with Belgium, by running eastward into the Scheldt.

⁹ 'Hist. de Roubaix,' par Th. Lauridan, 2^{me} partie, Hist. féodale, Roubaix, 1862, p. 305. The site of this château is occupied by a house of the date of Louis XV.

a fruit garden¹; nothing remains but its moat. This would have been the home of the Bouveries of Sainghin, who were probably dependants of some kind on their more powerful and wealthy neighbours at the larger castle².

Among the children of this household was Laurence Bouverie—the ancestor of the English branch of the family. He was born in 1542³; and would have often gazed at the old columns in the nave of the parish church, and at the noble clock tower at the west end, built in 1517, by the lord of Sainghin, and he would have watched the old feudal chief trying cases within his fief, on benches which then occupied the still vacant space before the churchyard⁴. But Laurence was not to spend his days as his ancestors had spent them. He early showed sympathies with opinions favourable to the Reformation, which prevailed widely⁵ in the neighbourhood of his home. He was often absent from Mass. His father suspected him of intimacy with some of the tenants who were known to be disaffected to the Church. At last his father threatened one day to bring him before the Inquisition if he did not hear Mass on the Sunday following. Laurence took alarm and ran away. He succeeded in reaching the free imperial city of Frankfort on the Main. He sat down at the gate of a silk-manufactory. Questioned by the owner, he told the story of his flight from Sainghin, and discovered that his questioner also was a refugee on account of religion. He was taken into the manufactory; and as ‘the whiteness of his hands’ showed that he was a gentleman, he was allowed to keep accounts and to look after the workmen. In the event he married his patron’s niece, Barbara Van den Hove, and ultimately succeeded to her uncle’s fortune.

At this epoch Frankfort was already connected with the religious fortunes of England. It contained the most important settlement of the Protestant exiles of 1555; a friendly municipal government and greater nearness to England

¹ Its present owner is Madame Descamps (1883).

² The Abbé Delpont, curé of Sainghin, reports that he had never met with any trace of the Bouveries in his parish. He added that the great Revolution had destroyed all local traditions in that part of France.

³ This date is on the portrait of Laurence de la Bouverie at Longford Castle, Wiltshire.

⁴ ‘Les bancs plaidoyables de la seigneurie’; Lauridan, ‘Hist. de Roubaix,’ u. s.

⁵ See the marriage registers of the Walloons of Canterbury and London preserved in Somerset House. The towns and villages near Sainghin constantly occur as birthplaces of Flemish emigrants: e. g. Roubaix, Tourcoing, Hoplines (Houplin), Peronne, Lannoy, &c.

made the English colony at Frankfort more numerous than those of Strasburg or Zürich. Frankfort witnessed, if not the birth, at least the fierce infancy of British Puritanism, fostered as it was by Knox and encouraged by Calvin¹. From Frankfort was made the first serious onslaught on the English Prayer-book, which was defeated by the energy of Dr. Cox of Strasburg; and Frankfort witnessed the struggle between Horne and Ashley about Church discipline, which, if its issues were less far-reaching, was not less destructive of the peace of the colony. Burnet observes that the 'troubles' at Frankfort must have been a 'scandal²' in the eyes of foreigners. They were probably drawing to a close when Laurence de la Bouverie reached the city; but anything that he may have heard about them would not have attached him to a church so torn by dissensions. He might indeed have met at Frankfort Grindal, who was afterwards Bishop of London³, and Parker's successor at Canterbury⁴, or Nowell, who in 1560 became Dean of St. Paul's, or Cox, the opponent of Knox, who afterwards was Bishop of Ely. But of any such meeting no record survives; and it is probable that at Frankfort, as afterwards in England, Laurence de la Bouverie did not seek for religious sympathy beyond the frontiers of the little Protestant community to which his fellow refugees from the Walloon country generally belonged. When he left Frankfort for England he was not in quest of any religious advantages, but of personal safety.

The reaction against the Reformation had conquered Italy and Spain. It had already begun in Germany. The Jesuits were at Cologne, at Würzburg, at Ingolstadt. From Cologne, their influence extended throughout the Rhineland, from Würzburg, throughout Franconia. Canisius was at work in Southern Germany: Alva, in a very different sense, in the Netherlands. Frankfort was Protestant: but the great fair had opened the door to the missionaries of

¹ The 'Troubles of Frankfort' was printed in 1572; reprinted, for the use of Parliament, in 1642; and afterwards in the 'Phoenix,' vol. ii. pp. 44-203, London, 1708. See Calvin's letter ('Phoenix,' ii. 69) discussing the 'multas tolerabiles ineptias' of the Prayer-book, the 'leavings of Popish dregs,' &c. It is dated Geneva, Jan. 22, 1555. Cf. Churton's 'Life

of Nowell,' p. 29.

² 'History of the Reformation,' ii. 543-4, ed. Pocock. Compare Fuller's 'Church History of Brit.' book viii. §§ 2, 3.

³ A. D. 1559.

⁴ A. D. 1575. Grindal was sent from Strasburg to Frankfort in 1554, and returned in May, 1555. Strype's 'Grindal,' p. 10, London, 1710.

the Reaction¹, and it was reported that, upon Alva's arrival in the Low Countries with 10,000 veterans, the trading people, both of town and country, were withdrawing from Flanders in great numbers². These tidings from the country of his birth could not but affect Laurence de la Bouverie; among the emigrants would have been friends of his boyhood; and old associations may have combined with the dictates of prudence to persuade him to seek a home in England.

The date of his emigration is not absolutely certain, but it probably took place in the year 1567. He crossed over to Sandwich, where a colony of French and Dutch refugees³ had been established for some years⁴; and his easy circumstances⁵ enabled him to relieve the distress of this rapidly increasing body of his poorer countrymen⁶.

Not long afterwards Laurence de la Bouverie removed⁷ to Canterbury,—another centre of Flemish refugees. Surrounded by his family of eight children, he varied a life of commercial industry by social and charitable duties⁸. He

¹ Ranke, 'History of the Popes' (Austin's transl.), ii. 20.

² On Sept. 8, 1567, the Duchess of Parma, the acting governor of the Netherlands, wrote to Philip II that in a few days above 100,000 men had left the country with their money and goods, and that more were following every day; 'History of the French, Walloon, Dutch, and other Refugees, settled in England from the reign of Henry VIII.,' &c., by J. S. Burn (London, Longmans, 1846), p. 4; Prescott's 'History of the reign of Philip II.,' bk. iii. c. 1, p. 328 (ed. 1855); Strada, 'De Bello Belgico,' tom. i. p. 357. On the number of Flemish emigrants to England see Froude's 'History of England,' ix. p. 172; 'Bulletin de l'Académie Royale de Bruxelles,' tom. xiv. p. 127.

³ The refugees at Sandwich were chiefly engaged in the silk manufacture as well as in that of baize and flannel; Halsted's 'Kent,' p. 253.

⁴ It attracted Abp. Parker's kindly notice on his visit to the town in August, 1563; Strype's 'Parker,' ed. 1711. The 'strangers' petitioned Elizabeth to allow them to settle at Stamford, where they would be under the eye of Lord Burleigh (ib., App. p. 114).

⁵ Burn refers to a MS. in his possession giving an account of the relief of the poor in 'l'Eglise de Sandeunyt Françoise,' between 1568 and 1570: 'De Laurens des Bouveries adcause de bayes (baize) p. luy vendues icy pour le droit des pauvres R^t xxs' (ib. p. 56). In a 'list of contributors to the poor being settlers at Sandwich,' Oct. 1571, the names of Jan des Bouveries as well as of Laurens des Bouveries occur.

⁶ In 1565 there were 129 Walloon families in Sandwich: in 1582 not less than 351, when they outnumbered the English; cf. Halsted's 'Kent,' iv. p. 253.

⁷ Sandwich, however, was a home of some members of the Bouverie family for many years. In 1600, James, the son of Antony des Bouveries, was living there (Halsted's 'Kent,' iii. 373, note). Susan, the daughter of Jan de la Bouverie, was born there: she married the son of an old Flemish neighbour, Simon Oudart, whose father was a native of Peronne (Wall. Register of Marriages, Cant., September 10, 1598).

⁸ According to Collins he was already a contributor to the poor-rate of the Walloon Church at Canterbury in 1568. He was often sponsor to

lived to see two of his daughters married to Londoners; and this attraction led him to visit the capital. He outlived his Frankfort wife, Barbara; and in the last decade of the sixteenth century married a Flemish widow¹, who probably survived him.

The eldest son of Laurence de la Bouverie, Edouard, was born at Canterbury, and was still living there in 1604². He appears to have moved to Broad Street³ in the city of London early in the reign of James I; and to have married at Cologne⁴ a Flemish lady, whose grandfather Tiberkin⁵ had suffered death in Germany for his attachment to the Reformed opinions. Tiberkin was said to have been drawn to the stake by his own coach-horses⁶; an insulting aggravation of his sufferings which would at least show him to have been a person in easy circumstances. His daughter Mary was married to Jaspas de Fournestaux; and their child became the wife of Edouard des Bouveries; thus reinforcing the existing religious traditions of the family.

Edouard des Bouveries died in 1625, the year of the

the children of his fellow-countrymen, and, among others, to a daughter of the pastor of the Walloon congregation. Walloon Register of Baptisms, Canterbury, from July 24, 1590 to April 15, 1602: 'Le Dimanche 18 de Juin, 1592, la fille de Samuel le Chevalier, ministre de la parole de Dieu, ayant pour parains François Biscoy et Laurentz des Bouuries.'

¹ Catharine Pipelart, the widow of Michel Castel. She was a refugee from Peronne near Sainghin.

² Cant. Wall. Reg. (Foreign Churches, 28 v.): 'Jan. 22, 1604. Jacques fils de Elias Mauroys, tesmoins Samuel Desbouuries et Edouard Desbouuries.'

³ Cf. Cooper, 'Lists of Foreign Protestants and aliens resident in England,' Camden Society, 1862, p. 88. 'A true certificate of the names of strangers residing and dwelling within the City of London and the Liberties thereof,' was made out by order of the Privy Council, under the Mayoralty of Sir George Bolles, on September 16, 1618. In this document Edouard le Bouere, born in Canterbury, is described as living in Broad Street.

⁴ 'Visit. of London,' K. xix. p. 219 in the College of Arms, qu. by Collins.

⁵ This Tiberkin probably came from Roubaix, which had contributed other members of the family as refugees to England. Cant. Wall. Marr. Regist.: 'Mai 30, 1596. Guillaume Tiberquin, fils de Pasquier, natif de Roubaix' (Roubaix). In 1596, another member of the family was scourged at Lille and banished to Amsterdam for his activity in propagating the Reformed opinions. He returned to Lille without a passport, was imprisoned, and again banished; 'Historie de Roubaix,' 1^{re} partie, p. 260. 'L'église sous la croix,' p. 127. The Flemish spelling is Thiberghien.

⁶ The authority for this is a MS. which was in the possession of the first Lord Folkestone, and was consulted by Collins. Dr. Pusey used to speak of this document as containing the history of his ancestors. Some of the Tiberkins were settled in 'the Close' of St. Saviour's Church, Southwark. Cooper's 'Lists,' &c., p. 90: 'Daniel Tiberkin, b. at Frankfort in High Germany, a dier, dweller in the Close of 30 years' continuance. Peter Coege, his son-in-law, born at Liell in Flanders under the Archduke; a dier of 14 years' continuance.'

accession of Charles I. Like the Georges, the Bouveries took two generations after their settlement in England ere they could unlearn their foreign ways. They were members of a colony of foreign settlers on the soil of England. Their language was foreign: they spoke French—at least, when at home. They married foreign wives. They belonged to a foreign religious community, the doctrines and constitution of which kept it in separation from the English Church, although some of its members were from time to time on friendly terms with English prelates, and others were allowed such privileges as the use of the crypt of Canterbury Cathedral¹.

During the long life of Laurence de la Bouverie's grandson all this was changed. Edouard des Bouveries left three daughters, and a son who had been born in 1621. This second Edouard was therefore only four years old when his father died. He had to make his way in the world, and he made it. He lived through the struggle between Charles and his Parliament; between Puritanism and the Church. He probably thought it prudent in a man of foreign descent and connexions to keep clear of a quarrel between Englishmen. He kept close to business, became a leading Turkey merchant, and made a large fortune. He lived to be knighted by James II. He bought a place at Cheshunt, and died there in 1694, at the ripe age of seventy-three, and was buried as a Churchman and citizen of London in St. Andrew Under-shaft. If Sir Edward des Bouveries was born a foreigner, he certainly died an Englishman.

It is probable that, as a young man, he crossed the line which separated his ancestral faith from that of the Church in England. His wife, Anne Fosterie², although of foreign Protestant extraction, belonged to a family in communion with the English Church. Whether Edward des Bouveries conformed to the Church before or after his marriage is unknown. But he was only thirteen years of age when Archbishop Laud advised Charles that foreigners who were

¹ The Flemish immigrants generally were not popular in England. They gave great offence both in London and in the provincial towns where they settled (Halsted's 'Kent,' iii. 373). Probably English jealousy of their industry and enterprise had as much to do with this as the difference of blood, language, and religion. Indeed this last particular would not have

weighed with the Puritan section of the population. Cf. Burn, p. 6.

² Her father was John Fosterie, a London merchant. Peter de la Fosterie had married Edward Bouverie's aunt Leah. See the account of Samuel Fosterie in the 'True Certificate,' 1618; also Cooper's 'Lists,' &c., p. 87; 'Heralds' Visitation of 1634,' xiii.

born in England 'should be called to conform with the English Church¹.' Laud had an eye to his own diocese, and he observed that 'the Dutch churches of Canterbury and Sandwich are great nurseries of Inconformity in these parts².' Accordingly the foreign Protestants were enjoined 'to repair to their several parish churches, to hear divine service and sermons, and to perform all duties and payments required in that behalf³.' Those who had been born abroad 'might use their own discipline': but the Prayer-book was to be translated into French and Dutch 'for the better settling of their children to the English Government⁴.' Conversion by compulsion is not worth much when successful; and, generally speaking, it does not succeed. The Mayor of Canterbury petitioned against the Royal Injunction. The enforced conformity would oblige that city to support the Walloon poor; would ruin the silk trade; would throw many English boys and girls out of work, as the foreigners would emigrate, rather than submit. Laud overruled these somewhat unspiritual objections⁵: but those who are most deeply sensible of his services to the cause of religion in England must own that, on this as on other occasions, the great Primate's judgment was disturbed by the admixture of political motives. We do not know whether these events had any or what influence on the decision of Edward des Bouveries: he was living in London, and the Walloons in London were probably unmolested. But it is of course possible that the policy of the government may have co-operated with domestic and higher motives to make him turn his steps towards the Church of England.

The successors of Sir Edward des Bouveries rapidly improved the temporal fortunes which had been conquered by his industry and application. Of his eleven children, two younger sons were distinguished. Jacob represented Folkestone in Parliament under King William III. and Queen Anne. Christopher was knighted by Anne; and

¹ Rymer's 'Foedera,' vol. xix. 588.

² Ibid.

³ It is probable that when the Flemings were first welcomed as settlers in England, hopes were entertained that they would gradually pass into communion with the Church. The vigilant and highly-organized life of their community must have been imperfectly understood. As illustrating it, at a later period, see 'Lettres et

Memoires sur l'excommunication de deux Hérétiques opiniâtres, qui ont entrepris de faire un schisme à Canterbury. A Londres, imprimé pour Thomas Parkhurst, à l'enseigne de la Bible et Trois Couronnes dans le Poultry, 1698.'

⁴ Laud's 'Works,' vi. part 1, p. 28. Prynne's 'Canterbury's Doom,' p. 402.

⁵ Laud's 'Works,' vii. pp. 134-136.

was father of the cultivated young scholar and antiquarian, John Bouverie, who died at Smyrna in 1750. The eldest son, William, trode more exactly in his father's footsteps; as a prosperous Turkey merchant he built up year by year the fabric of family wealth and reputation. In 1714, Queen Anne made him a baronet. He married twice; and each time a lady of English name. He lived to see the present dynasty seated on the throne of England, died in 1717, at the age of sixty, and was buried, as a London merchant, in the Church of St. Catharine Cree.

Of Sir William des Bouveries' children, Edward, the only son of his first wife, died young. The eldest son of his second wife, Anne Urry, succeeded the first baronet as Sir Edward des Bouveries; he sat for Shaftesbury under the first two Georges, and died at Aix-les-Bains, without issue, in 1736. His brother, Sir Jacob, obtained an Act of Parliament which completed the naturalization of the family, by enabling them to exchange the foreign surname, Des Bouveries, for Bouverie. Sir Jacob Bouverie was Recorder and, in 1741, Member for Salisbury. His position in London and in Wiltshire, his activity in promoting public objects, and his relations with Sir Robert Walpole, paved the way for his elevation to the peerage; and, by letters patent, dated June 29, 1747, he was created Viscount Folkestone of Folkestone in the county of Kent, and Baron Longford of Longford in the county of Wiltshire. As a commoner, Lord Folkestone had been twice married. By his first wife, Miss Mary Clarke of Hardingstone, he had four children. His eldest son, William, was created in 1765 Earl of Radnor; his second son, Edward, represented Salisbury; while of his daughters, one married the Hon. and Rev. George Talbot, and the other Anthony Ashley, fourth Earl of Shaftesbury. His second wife, the Hon. Elizabeth Marsham, daughter of Robert, first Lord Romney, will have greater interest for my readers. Her eldest son, Jacob, died in infancy: her second son, Philip, who was born Oct. 8, 1746, lived, as has been narrated, to become the heir of the Puseys, to bear their name, and to be the father of the subject of this memoir.

Thus between Laurence de la Bouverie and the Professor of Hebrew at Oxford, five generations intervened. Dr. Pusey's grandfather, Viscount Folkestone, was grandson of Sir Edward des Bouveries, the Turkey merchant, who, as an old man, was knighted by James II.; and the grandfather of this Sir Edward was Laurence de la Bouverie

himself, the first member of the family who set foot on English soil; the fugitive from the old family chateau near Lille; the silk-manufacturer at Frankfort.

For reasons which will appear presently, something must here be said about the family of Pusey's grandmother on his father's side. The Marshams came from Norfolk; they settled in London at the beginning of the seventeenth century. The second son of Alderman Thomas Marsham, who died in 1624, was the most remarkable member of his family. John Marsham was a Westminster boy: in 1619, he went to St. John's College, Oxford, when Laud, who became Bishop of St. David's in 1621, was still President. It is probable that John Marsham owed to Laud both his love of learning and his principles. After spending some years in foreign travel and in the study of law, he was attached to the English embassy at Fontainebleau; and on the outbreak of the civil wars, followed King Charles to Oxford, as one of the six clerks in Chancery. He shared the misfortunes of the Royal cause; compounded for his estate; and, during the Protectorate, buried himself in his books. His tastes and his knowledge combined to make him an antiquarian statistician. In his most elaborate work¹ he discusses the early history of Egypt, as fully as was possible when the hieroglyphics were still undeciphered; and, in taking up an intermediate position between the chronological extension claimed for the Egyptian dynasties by Scaliger² and the endeavour of Petavius³ to dispute the claim by altogether denying the accuracy of Africanus and Eusebius, Marsham displays his learning and research. The publication of this work was expected with interest by Thorndike⁴; it at once gave him a recognized position among European scholars⁵, although it has failed to command the unreserved approval of the most learned of his descendants⁶. At his death Marsham left some unfinished works on the Peruvian Empire, on the Roman provinces and legions, and on ancient

¹ 'Chronicus Canon Egyptiacus, Ebraicus, Graecus, et disquisitiones D. Joannis Marshami,' fol. Lond. 1672. He had previously published a smaller work, 'Diatriba Chronologica,' Lond., J. Flesher, 1649, the preface to which is interesting.

² 'Can. Isag,' ii. pp. 122, 274.

³ 'Doctr. Temp,' ix. 15; x. 17.

⁴ 'Works,' vol. v. p. 542, ed. 1854.

⁵ See Antony à Wood's account of

the acknowledgments of his book which Marsham received from the Royal Librarian in Paris, and other representatives of continental learning, 'Ath. Ox.' ed. 1692, vol. ii. p. 594. Père Simon writes of 'the great Marsham of England.'

⁶ Pusey speaks severely of his ancestor's treatment of the prophecy of the Seventy Weeks ('Daniel the Prophet,' 2nd edition, p. 199).

coins. The Restoration had brought him prosperity and honours. In 1660 he became Member for Rochester. He was restored to his post in the Court of Chancery ; made, in succession, a Knight and a Baronet ; and in 1685 died at Bushey Hall in Hertfordshire.

His sons¹ were literary men like their father : in his eldest grandson learning gave place to politics. Sir Robert Marsham was Member for Maidstone in the last three Parliaments of Queen Anne and in the first year of George I. In 1708 he married Elizabeth, daughter of Sir Cloudesley Shovel, whose exploits on the coasts of Spain and Barbary and before Toulon belong to English history ; but in the year preceding his daughter's marriage to Sir Robert Marsham his life had been cut short by a disaster which was regarded as a national calamity. The fleet was returning from Toulon in bad weather when, on the evening of Oct. 22, 1707, the admiral's ship struck the Gibstone rock, off the Scilly Isles. In two minutes, says an eye-witness, nothing was to be seen ; and nine hundred persons had perished. On the day after the wreck the admiral's body was washed ashore, plundered by the islanders, and buried in the sand. The outrage was discovered ; and the corpse was taken to London, to receive such honour as attaches to interment in Westminster Abbey².

It is probable that an alliance with the family of an officer so distinguished and regretted combined with Sir Robert Marsham's strong Hanoverian sympathies to recommend him to the favour of George I. In 1716 he was raised to the peerage as Baron Romney, and was made Governor of Dover Castle. He died in 1724. His widow married the third Earl of Hyndford, and died four years after the birth of Philip Bouverie, her eldest grandson.

Lord Romney's eldest surviving child, Lady Folkestone, was born in 1711, and was fifty years of age at the date of her husband's death. The remainder of her life was devoted to her surviving son Philip, and her affection was fully returned³. She enjoined him not to marry until he was

¹ Sir John Marsham undertook to write a history of England. His brother Robert, who succeeded him in the baronetcy, had an excellent collection of Greek medals. A student by temperament and inclination, he sat for Maidstone under William III. and Anne, and died in 1703.

² Stanhope's 'History of England

under Queen Anne,' 1870, pp. 311-12 ; Stanley's 'Hist. Mem. of Westminster Abbey,' 241-2 ; Campbell's 'Admirals,' iii. 28-30.

³ The family Bible at Pusey contains an inscription which shows the tender and enduring love of the mother and son for each other.

thirty years old ; and, after making an unsuccessful proposal at that age, he resolved to remain a single man during his mother's lifetime. He brought her to his new home at Pusey ; and she lived until 1792, when her son was forty-six years of age. Such was the empire of habit or inclination that he lived on as a bachelor for six years, and then on August 20, 1798, married Lady Lucy Cave.

Lady Lucy Pusey came of a stock which was already ancient in the days of the Plantagenets ; the family tradition connected it with the martyred Edward, king of the West Saxons¹. The marriage of one Robert Sherard, in Henry IV.'s reign, with Agnes, daughter of Sir Lawrence Hawberk, brought them to Stapleford in Leicestershire². William Sherard, of Stapleford, stood high in the favour of the first two Stuarts. James I. knighted him in 1622. Charles I. made him, in 1627, an Irish peer, as Lord Sherard and Baron Leitrim in Ireland. He died in 1640 at the age of fifty-two ; his widow, Abigail Lady Sherard, who lived until 1659, was remarkable for her talent, her energy, and her high spirit. She was, among other things, a restorer of churches³ in an age when men were largely engaged in dismantling them ; nor did she escape the notice of the dominant Puritans, who fined her heavily for her attachment to the Church and King⁴. Her son and grandson were Lords Lieutenants of Rutlandshire, and Knights of the shire for the county of Leicester ; they accepted without difficulty the Revolution of 1688, and the Hanoverian Succession. George I. knew how to reward the personal attachment of the old English gentry ; and Bennet, third Lord Sherard, entered the peerage of England in 1714, as Lord Harborough, Baron of Harborough ; while in 1718 he was created Viscount Sherard of Stapleford, and in 1719 Earl of Harborough. He died without issue in 1732, but as the patent of his earldom included a collateral remainder, the title passed to Philip Sherard of Whissendine, grandson of the second son of the first Lord Sherard, who had been

¹ There is a full account of the family in Nichol's '*Leicestershire*,' vol. ii. part I, pp. 333-354.

² Stapleford is on the river Eye, above Melton Mowbray, and on the borders of Rutlandshire.

³ She rebuilt the south aisle of Stapleford parish church, and roofed the chancel of the church at Whissendine. Nichol, '*Leicestershire*,' vol. ii. part I,

p. 334, calls her a 'woman of uncommon abilities and unbounded benevolence.'

⁴ In 1645 the Committee of Sequestration fined her £500 for 'delinquency.' She had a great taste for antiquities ; and it is to her that the pedigree of the Sherards owes its preservation in such completeness. Nichol, u. s.

made an Irish peer by Charles I. The second earl died in 1750: he was succeeded by his eldest son Bennet, who married four times, and died without issue in 1770. Upon this the title devolved on his brother Robert, the fourth Earl of Harborough, and father of Lady Lucy Pusey. He had taken Holy Orders, and at the time of his succession, after the fashion of the day, was Rector of two livings¹, Prebendary of Southwell, and Canon of Salisbury². He was twice married³. Unless his portrait at Pusey does him an injustice, Lord Harborough was not a man of great ability, but he was deeply attached to his daughter, Lady Lucy, and she held and could use the key to his somewhat undemonstrative nature. When in 1790 she married Sir Thomas Cave, of Stanford Park, who was heir to the barony of Braye, and Member for Leicestershire, she was following family precedents⁴; and this circumstance may have served to overcome Lord Harborough's reluctance to part with her. Her first experience of married life was as short as it was bright. Her husband used to say, 'This is too much happiness to last,' and his early death on January 16, 1792, at the age of twenty-six, left her a widow at twenty-one. She returned to live with her father at Stapleford, and when in 1798 Lord Harborough heartily sanctioned her engagement with the Hon. Philip Pusey, he sacrificed the pleadings of personal affection to his judgment respecting the requirements of his daughter's future happiness. When the wedding day arrived, and it became his duty to give her away at the altar, he resolutely lay in bed without at the time assigning any reason. He could not bear the wrench of parting with her a second time. He died eight months after her marriage, on April 21, 1799⁵. His son and successor, the fifth Earl, Lady

¹ Teigh, in Rutlandshire, and Whistoe, in Huntingdonshire.

² In 1773 Lord Harborough resigned his Church preferments, excepting the Canonry of Salisbury.

³ His first wife was Catharine, daughter of Edward Hearst, Esq., of Salisbury. His second, a daughter of William Reeves, Esq., of Melton Mowbray.

⁴ The first Lord Sherard and the third Earl of Harborough had each married a Miss Cave, of Stanford.

⁵ Of Lady Lucy Pusey's uncles, John Sherard was a Fellow of Merton.

He organized a volunteer regiment of members of the Bar during the rebellion of 1745, and died in the following year, at the age of thirty-three. His brother Daniel had died in 1744 at Port Royal, in Jamaica, as first lieutenant of the Falmouth. Philip Sherard was in the Guards: he distinguished himself in the campaign of 1762, and died a Lieutenant-General. Lady Dorothy Sherard married the Rev. James Torkington, Rector of King's Ripton, Huntingdonshire; another sister died at Bath in 1781.

Lucy's eldest brother, only enjoyed the title and estates for eight years and a half, and left it to a boy ten years of age, in December, 1807.

The reader may inquire why so much space should be given to family history in the life of a man who thought as cheaply as did Pusey of all distinctions between human beings, except those which touch their relations to their Creator. The answer is twofold. So much legend has been entwined round Pusey's life by the credulous ingenuity of controversial passion, that it is desirable, once for all, as far as possible, to state all the facts that bear upon the subject¹. But, further, every family history is interesting, not only as a substantial part of the history of the country, but also as illustrating the elements of individual capacity and character which, although differently combined, reappear in successive generations; and we need not be traducianists in psychology in order to believe that when GOD forms a human life to do some appointed task, His preparatory action may be traced in the circumstances of hereditary descent not less clearly than in other provisions whether of nature or of grace. It is not possible to apportion, with even approximate accuracy, the items of Pusey's indebtedness to his several ancestors. Yet perhaps to the Bouveries he may have owed the enterprise, the business capacity, the intensity, the sanguine temperament which again and again, throughout his career, carried him through periods of discouragement and trial that would have crushed the spirits of ordinary men. The Latin complexion of some features of his thought belonged to the blood, his strong sense of personal responsibility for convictions, to the religious history, of the Bouveries. In private conversation Pusey would sometimes refer to the career of Laurence de la Bouverie and the death of Tiberkin: if their theology was, in his judgment, often wrong, he took pleasure in dwelling on their loyalty to conviction. 'We do not know,' he said on one occasion, 'what their positive faith may have been exactly, but it may be hoped that they meant to give their best to God, and for that which they held to be His truth.' These passages in his family history appear to have enhanced Pusey's sense of the moral value of temporal loss or suffering, as a test of sincerity. It always gave him pleasure to hear of any one who had foregone or undergone

¹ The writer may illustrate this by adding that since 1882 he has been informed by a correspondent of a

belief that Pusey was 'sent by his parents to a Jesuit college in Flanders for his education.'

anything for the truth's sake. 'What a privilege,' he would say, 'for so and so ; I hope he will show himself worthy of it.' On the other hand, he also thought that the evil of persecution, in stiffening or exaggerating prejudices which it could not subdue, was illustrated in the case of his ancestors. The fires of Smithfield were, he often said, not only a crime but a blunder. They had done more than anything else, in the last three centuries, to perpetuate religious dissension by embittering religious feelings.

Pusey's love of learning¹ finds its parallel in a Marsham ancestor. Sir John Marsham's books discover a strenuous pursuit of knowledge for its own sake, and independently of its attractiveness or its market value ; and he matured his knowledge by years of incessant work during the time of the Commonwealth. Although Pusey owed very much to the German friends among whom he spent two of the most growing and active years of his mental life, he brought his hereditary passion for knowledge with him to Germany. When he left Berlin it was observed with amusement, not perhaps unmixed with generous admiration, that a wonderful young Englishman had gone off with the spoils of the libraries in his pocket or in his head. His grandmother, Lady Folkestone, contributed other qualities which belonged to the granddaughter of Sir Cloudesley Shovel : her portrait at Pusey, which is attributed to Gainsborough, has more resemblance to her grandson than that of any other of his progenitors. The firm mouth, at once benevolent and determined, recalls Pusey as many have seen him, writing and arguing through many a weary controversy, in the later years of his life, 'fighting,' as he would say, 'an up-hill battle for the Church, but resolved to do what might yet be done, and to do it, if it might be, without wounding charity.'

To his mother's family Pusey was principally indebted for that intense natural affectionateness which did so much to shape his life, and to colour his writings. But she also seems to have done more than any other person to give a character and direction to his thoughts about religious subjects. The Sherards do not appear to have possessed the intellectual qualities of the Marshams, or the enterprise and energy of the Bouveries : and their churchmanship was apparently, in the generations which immediately preceded

¹ This disinterested love of learning was shared by his brother Philip, by his son, and, it may be added, by


his nephew, the present head of the family.

Lady Lucy, of the type which was generally in vogue among the early adherents of the House of Hanover. But it had been otherwise with the Sherards of the seventeenth century; and beyond any other ancestors of Pusey they were conscious of their relations with the religious and distant past. Lady Lucy was the daughter of a clergyman, and she used to talk to her son as if she represented a religious temper which had belonged to her race in earlier days. 'All that I know about religious truth,' Pusey used to say, 'I learned, at least in principle, from my mother.' Doubtless it was an indefinite influence, as are many of those which shape our lives, but it was not therefore a powerless one.

Oxford

HORACE HART, PRINTER TO THE UNIVERSITY





[illegible]

WELLS BINDERY INC.
WALTHAM, MASS.
MAR. 1956

0000000000

CLAPP



3 5002 00172 6327

Liddon, Henry Parry
Life of Edward Bouverie Pusey, doctor of

BX 5199 .P9 L5 1894 1

Liddon, Henry Parry, 1829-
1890.

Life of Edward Bouverie
Pusey, doctor of divinity,

283.092

P97

l

(v.1)

239953

